# The New REPUBLIC

*Published Weekly*

Wednesday July 9, 1930


# How Much Freedom in the New Schools?

## by JOHN DEWEY

*(The last article in a series on the New Education Ten Years After)*


FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY

FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR

VOL. LXIII. NO. 814

Entered as Second-Class matter December 6, 1917, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THEATRES

"MIGHTIEST WAR DRAMA EVER SEEN"
N. Y. American.

ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT

A Universal Picture—Presented by Carl Laemmle

Directed by Lewis Milestone

"A notable achievement, sincere, earnest, vivid and graphic. Better than anything so far done."
Mordaunt Hall, N. Y. Times.

"Enormously compelling talking motion picture. As a show something to get definitely excited about! A very fine motion picture. —Howard Barnes, Herald Tribune.

CENTRAL Theatre, Broadway and 47th Street
Twice Daily, 2:45—8:45
3 times, Saturday and Sunday, 2:45—5:45—8:45

THEATRE GUILD PRESENTS
THE NEW
GARRICK GAIETIES
GUILD THEA., 52nd Street, West of Broadway.
Eves., 8:50. Matinees, Thurs. and Sat., 2:50

Do your part for humanity

—tell people that cancer in its early stages is curable, in its late stages is not curable.

The odds are always against your having cancer—but make sure. Consult your physician yourself, urge others to do so.

This work is made possible by generous public support of the sale of the little Christmas book and by voluntary contributions. Our work for 1930 depends on your continued help.

For further information and free literature, address

HELP CONTROL CANCER

THE NEW YORK CITY COMMITTEE
American Society for the Control of Cancer
25 EAST 75TH STREET, NEW YORK

BOOKS

Just Published

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF RAW MATERIALS

By Benjamin B. Wallace and Lynn R. Edminster

The unequal distribution of raw materials among the nations of the world has given rise to many difficult problems in the field of international relations. In spite of the growing economic interdependence of nations there has been in recent years a marked increase of restrictions upon access to essential materials. This volume analyzes the international issues raised by the controls and discusses principles and machinery that might be utilized in adjusting international controversies in this field.

$3.50

BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
Washington, D. C.

To Lovers of Good Literature

$1.50 for all

H. G. WELLS'S "FIRST AND LAST THINGS: A Confession of Faith and Rule of Life." 160 pp., bound.
CHARLES DARWIN'S "ORIGIN OF SPECIES." Final, unabridged edition: 494 pp., bound.
H. BRADLAUGH BONNER'S "CHRISTIAN HELL." 160 pages: 28 illus.
HON. BERTRAND RUSSELL'S "HAS RELIGION MADE USEFUL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVILIZATION?"
THE RATIONALIST ANNUAL for 1931 (October next).
THE LITERARY GUIDE AND RATIONALIST REVIEW (Monthly: 6 issues).
ALL the above (the books by return, the periodicals as issued) will be sent in return for $1.50 (M.O.) subscribed NOW to

THE RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION LTD.
4, 5 and 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E. C. 4 (England)

S. BURTON HEATH
in The New York Telegram says of
Public Ownership on Trial
by FREDERICK L. BIRD and FRANCES M. RYAN
Foreword by DR. JOHN BAUER

"Public Ownership on Trial will not be a best seller. But it will remain for some time the best authority on that interesting question 'Can public ownership succeed?'"

75 cents a copy, postpaid. Order from
THE NEW REPUBLIC
421 West 21st Street New York City

# The New REPUBLIC

## A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1930 NUMBER 814


## Contents


The Week ..... 189

Editorials

G. E. and the Lords of Industry ..... 192
The Free Speech Barometer ..... 193

General Articles

Radio for Robots ..... William Orton 195
India Rejects the Simon Report ..... Savel Zimand 199
Laid Off ..... Helen Hall 202
How Much Freedom in New Schools? .. John Dewey 204
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 207
Admonition to the Pocahontases ..... Stark Young 208

Correspondence ..... 209

Reviews of Books

Modern Culture ..... Lewis Mumford 210
Emily Dickinson Again ..... Babette Deutsch 211
Two Books on Satan ..... Cuthbert Wright 212
Tall Tales and Torrid Trails .... Percy H. Boynton 212
Strindberg ..... Elsa M. Allen 213
A Bravery of Earth ..... Edith H. Walton 214
Notes on Novels ..... 214


## The Week

SENATOR Hiram Johnson of California, please take the stand. When you say of the pending naval pact, "It is a billion-dollar treaty for the purchase of naval inferiority," do you mean that if the treaty were defeated and naval competition continued, you would advocate spending less than a billion dollars for new naval construction? Does the treaty itself necessitate that we undertake the permitted building which would cost a billion? Do you want economy, or the greatest navy in the world? You cannot have both. Could you devise any formula which would satisfy your conception of parity, but which would not be thought by Great Britain and Japan to relegate them to inferiority? Do you really want naval limitation? If so, how do you propose to get it? How do you, nominally a progressive, reconcile your alliance in this issue with Senator Moses of New Hampshire, one of the most outspoken reactionaries in the Senate? Are you wholly satisfied with your support by William Randolph Hearst, the confirmed journalistic jingo, who is always trying to stir up trouble with Great Britain or Japan or Mexico? Do you favor a policy of peace or a policy of war? How can we avoid war if we persist in arming to the teeth? Do you expect persons who entertain any hope for the future of civilization to follow your reckless course of inflaming suspicion and accepting no test of policy except national aggrandizement?

When President Hoover vetoed the pension bill for the World War veterans which Congress had passed, he was roundly praised for his common sense and courage. Perhaps he had turned over a new leaf in his dealings with Congress. But it later appeared that the veto was made with the knowledge that the House would support it, and that this consent of the House was contingent on the passage of a substitute bill. And the substitute bill, though it may cost the treasury somewhat less, is far more vicious in principle. The bill which Hoover vetoed conformed outwardly with the practice of compensating veterans only for injuries received as a result of service; the new bill frankly abandons this principle and compensates them for other disabilities as well. Thus the door is open wide to the political bribery and pension scandals which have harassed the nation for years after every other war. The President will probably accept the substitute. Somehow, whenever we think he has made a display of courage, his valor seems to ooze out at his heels.

THE Census Bureau, having added up the results of its April unemployment questionnaire for part of the country, announces that if the same percentage applies generally, the total for the nation will be 2,298,588. This is much less than most estimates have indicated. If it should be correct, we must remember that the Census questionnaire was so framed as to bring out a minimum number—only those were covered who had recently been regularly employed and were actively looking for work. This excludes casuals and those laid off or furloughed. 2,298,588 men and women genuinely out of a job and without a prospect of any are nothing to smile about. But the chances are that the figure is far too small. Industrial Commissioner Frances Perkins of New York state and Sarah Bernheim of the Labor Bureau, Inc., both point out that the basis of the tabulation excludes important industrial regions and does not furnish a fair sample. And even if these criticisms turn out to be wrong when

the final total is known, we have no assurance that the thousands of untrained, poorly paid and politically appointed census enumerators did a good job in this difficult matter. Many cases have been unearthed in which the proper questions were not even asked. The right way to get at the number of unemployed is not through the Census, but through continuous registration in a comprehensive system of employment exchanges.

A VICTORY for civil liberties was won when the United States Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision of District Judge Burrows denying citizenship to the Reverend Dr. Douglas MacIntosh of the Yale Divinity School and Miss Marie Bland, a Canadian war nurse. Dr. MacIntosh had said in his examination that he would not bear arms in every war in which the United States might be engaged, but only in those of which his conscience approved. Miss Bland had declared herself a conscientious pacifist whose religious scruples would forbid her to bear arms at all, though she was willing to nurse the wounded. The Circuit Court decided that "the rights of conscience are inalienable rights which the citizen need not surrender and which the government or society cannot take away." And "no more is demanded of an alien who becomes a citizen than of a natural-born citizen." Moreover, a citizen may make conscientious distinctions between wars, since such distinctions are recognized in international law under the Kellogg Pact. The one flaw in the decision is that it apparently recognizes the rights of conscience only when the person concerned is a Christian and a nationalist. It distinguishes these cases from that of Rosika Schwimmer, denied the right of citizenship by the Supreme Court, because she was an "absolute atheist" and "an uncompromising pacifist and was found to have no sense of nationalism." Apparently a person who conscientiously holds those beliefs has, in the mind of the Circuit Court, no conscience at al..

IN THE promised reorganization of the Tariff Commission, Mr. Hoover faces a final test of his sincerity in declaring for "a more scientific and businesslike method of tariff revision." His approval of the Smoot-Hawley act was justified by his supporters on the plea of its containing a "new" flexible-tariff provision through which a scientific rate-structure could be obtained. The provision to which they refer is neither radically new nor promising to those who desire a more equitable tariff. Such meager hopes as it offers depend principally on the make-up of the Tariff Commission, which, under the Smoot-Hawley act, has the power to recommend specific changes in rates for the approval or disapproval of the President. On the Commission's record it is safe to predict that such changes as the present members might recommend would be neither scientific nor businesslike. The President has the power to replace any or all of them within ninety days after signing the tariff bill. Reports are current in Washington, however, that Commissioners Brossard, Dennis, Dixon and possibly Marvin will be retained.

IN PARTICULAR, there is tremendous political pressure behind the drive for the reappointment of Edgar B. Brossard of Utah as chairman of the Commission. Even the little band of loyalists in the "inner circle" admit that this would be a calamity. But if Brossard is not reappointed, the President will have thrown down the gage to Senator Smoot, whose business interests in the domestic sugar industry the present chairman so ably defends. When Brossard's appointment as commissioner was announced in 1927, William Culbertson, a former member of the Commission, who had been appointed Minister to Rumania in order to rid the administration of his annoying liberalism in tariff proceedings, wrote to former Commissioner Costigan, "It's not much of a compliment to me that Brossard is selected to fit my place. If this appointment is to be regarded as a revelation of the President's policy, I feel fully justified in leaving the Commission. I did not suppose that Coolidge would do anything so rawly if he did it at all." As for Thomas O. Marvin, whose reappointment is also being urged by influential politicians, this former secretary of the Boston Home Markets Club was thoroughly shown up as a non-expert, entirely political high protectionist during the hearings of the Robinson Committee on the Tariff Commission. In his letter of resignation from a body which he had found intolerably permeated with political chicanery, former Commissioner Edward P. Costigan wrote, "Commissioners Marvin, Brossard and Lowell stand today a united tariff band, steadily pressing for higher tariff rates and against important reductions, reckless on occasions in their treatment of facts and the law. The tragedy of the Tariff Commission is directly traceable to certain tariff commissioners and certain Presidents." The tragedy will inevitably be repeated if President Hoover yields to the Smoot high-tariff-at-all-costs school of thought and reappoints either Mr. Brossard or Mr. Marvin.

FROM time to time during the past year, rumors have been in circulation that the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin was to be discontinued—rumors which have been gravely disturbing to all friends of this interesting and important attempt to find a new basis and a better technique for college education. We are glad to report that these stories were baseless at least so far as the next academic year is concerned. An official statement by the university authorities promises that the college will be continued in 1930-31 with Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn again its chairman. The course will, as before, cover the first two undergraduate years, and the general policy will continue to be that of the recent past. Two important innovations have been made, however. Each student

will devote most of his second year to an intensive first-hand study of some American city or region—perhaps Madison, or his birthplace, or some rural section near the university—producing as a result a small sketch for another "Middletown." The first few weeks of the second year will be turned over to a rapid survey of physical science in all its branches, most of the time being spent in various laboratories. These new ideas are consistent with the original plan of the college. We are glad to know that this useful enterprise, which has many bitter enemies, has been able to survive their attacks.

SUPREME Court Justice Pierce Butler, speaking in St. Louis on June 21, evidently was trying to answer the critics of the conservative majority of the Court. "One of the most important duties that rest upon courts," he said, "is to decline to give effect to invalid legislative enactments." This must be done whenever the court is presented with a case arising under legislation which conflicts with the Constitution. Such action does not prevent progress, said Justice Butler, because the Constitution may be amended. But judges cannot decide "according to their individual conceptions of right and wrong or to give effect to what in their view would best meet social and economic needs. They are bound to take the law as it is." Justice Butler in these words begs the whole question. The courts have to decide what the law is. When he and those who agree with him say that property is being taken without "due process of law," in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, because a commission regulating a utility-rate decides to allow a return on a lower valuation of the property rather than a higher one, is he taking the law "as it is"? Does the Constitution instruct us as to the complex principles of utility valuation in those simple words "due process of law"? Or is Justice Butler giving effect to what in his view would "best meet social and economic needs"? To assume that decisions of this character are mere mechanical applications of the fundamental law is either insincere or stupid.

A NOBLE ingenuousness is perhaps the last quality anyone would ascribe to Chicago newspapers, which are supposed to be completely hard-boiled, and yet it is precisely the quality revealed by The Tribune in the case of Alfred Lingle. Here was a reporter who was driven round the city in a Lincoln sedan by a uniformed chauffeur. The Tribune suspected nothing. Here was a leg-man on a salary of $65 a week (or was it really $75?) who spent his long vacations in Miami or Havana, who won and lost heavily on the races, who bought dollar cigars in boxes of fifty. The Tribune reflected innocently that small salaries go a long way in Chicago. It did not know that Lingle, when pressed for money, could go to his good friends among the aldermen, the civil-service commissioners, the police captains or the owners of gambling houses, and borrow a thousand or five thousand dollars on his simple word. It learned with surprise that its murdered leg-man had enjoyed an income of $60,000 a year. "There had been," it says in a touching editorial, "no suspicion of his integrity by the city editor's office." There had been only indignation against those who asserted that Lingle was connected with gangdom. These rumors, said The Tribune nine days after his murder,

> have been accepted by those wishing ill of The Tribune in its fight for decency and have been propagated by those who have neither the disposition nor the courage to make the fight themselves. . . . The Tribune can ignore the coyotes among the critics, but it will not permit them to stand in the way of the investigation.

AS A matter of fact, The Tribune has had appointed, as special assistant state's attorney in charge of the investigation, Mr. Charles F. Rathbun, who is a member of its own legal staff. Complaints against this appointment have been heard in Chicago, on the ground that Mr. Rathbun might not be zealous in tracing down clues possibly pointing to a connection between newspapers and the gangs which they so eloquently attack. It is also charged that reports from Chicago about the Lingle murder bear "about the same relation to the facts as censored dispatches from a Balkan war area." Even so, more and more prominent names are being linked with Lingle's activities, until it appears that the investigation of the crime will interfere with too many powerful interests for it ever to be carried to a successful conclusion. The murderer of Alfred Lingle, like the murderer of Arnold Rothstein, has about as much chance of getting caught as has the mechanical rabbit that flashes round a grayhound-racing track in front of its pursuers.

OFFICIAL documents recently published by the British government throw light on a sickening enterprise which still continues in China as it has for centuries past—the slave trade in children. Despite comfortable statements to the contrary which are made by white men in the treaty ports, little girls, and to a less extent boys, are bought by tens of thousands every year in all parts of China, including those districts which are supposedly most advanced. The civil war and the famine have in fact greatly augmented the trade. It is common for little girls to be exhibited in the streets with wisps of straw plaited into their hair as a sign that they are for sale, and the traffic goes on under the eyes of complacent officials. The child slaves are bought at the age of eleven or twelve, and kept until about the age of twenty, when they are usually set free or allowed to buy their freedom. In the interval, they do household drudgery, and also in a large proportion of the cases the girls are made the concubines of the male members of the household. Numbers of them are sold into commercialized prostitution, where they live under conditions about as horrible as can be imagined. So widespread is

the slave traffic that some Christian missionaries in China have been considering buying some of the children and then setting them free. They decided against this policy, however, on the ground that it would simply make the trade brisker and drive up the prices. One of these missionaries, after twenty years' experience in China, stated that before the recent recurrence of civil war the number of slave children probably was at least 2,000,000. In the recent years of war and famine, it must have become substantially greater.

THAT part of the slave trade which exists in China itself is probably beyond outside influence; but much of it is being conducted under the British flag. In Hongkong, the traffic in "Mui Tsai" (child slaves) is conducted about as openly as is bootlegging in New York. A pretense is made that the slave is being adopted by the master, and the price paid—in one case it was $87.50 for a fourteen-year-old girl—is actually made part of an official record, sealed by the police. For at least eight years, the British authorities in London have been trying without avail to have the local British government in Hongkong get the traffic under some sort of control. It was proposed in 1922 that every owner of Mui Tsai should register their names with the authorities, that these little slaves should be paid some wages, that they should be set free on reaching a certain age, and that there should be some sort of limit on the number of hours in a day that they might be forced to work. It would seem that these requirements were moderate enough, yet in eight years' time, London has been unable to get the government of Hongkong to put them into effect. Great Britain certainly ought to be held up to a higher standard than China; and both countries apparently need to be shamed into reformation through the force of public opinion. The League of Nations Commission on the Traffic in Women and Children has here a fertile field for inquiry.

## G. E. and the Lords of Industry

THE Chicago Journal of Commerce, which represents a substantial body of business opinion in the United States, in the same breath praises the new General Electric plan for unemployment insurance and denounces the Wagner bill for establishing a national system of employment exchanges. This bill, it argues, is but a step to unemployment insurance under government auspices. It quotes the recent editorial in The New Republic entitled "Doles for the Rich," to the effect that state insurance "must be preceded by well operated employment exchanges, so that there may be a good registry basis for the administration of relief." This opinion, it says, proves what the Wagner bill is intended to accomplish, and consequently the bill should be defeated. In the interest of fairness, it ought first to be said that there are good reasons for the passage of the bill entirely aside from its possible usefulness as a first step to insurance; a person who is not in favor of the latter measure might well support the bill. But the issue of private versus public insurance, raised by The Journal of Commerce, is one which deserves discussion.

If it is desirable to insure workers against unemployment, why should we not be satisfied when a great company like the General Electric announces a plan to achieve that end? The scheme itself sounds like a good one, and presumably will work well in practice. Any plant under the corporation may adopt it, on the affirmative vote of 60 percent of the eligible employees. Any employee is eligible who has had a year of continuous service. When an employee enrolls in the plan, he agrees to pay one percent of his earnings into a trust fund. The company contributes an equal amount. If at any time the employee's earnings fall below half his average full-time pay, his contribution ceases. The fund is administered by trustees, at the expense of the company, which guarantees that it will earn 5-percent interest. When a member receives notice of a "temporary lay-off," he draws compensation out of the fund at the rate of half his normal earnings, up to $20.00 a week. He may receive this payment for not more than ten weeks in any twelve months. In times of emergency, all working employees must contribute, including salaried officers. To the insurance plan is added a program for increasing the stability of employment and minimizing the need for out-of-work benefits.

Is not capitalistic industry thus confounding its critics, who say that it is not concerned with the welfare of the worker? In 1929, the General Electric had 88,000 employees. A few other large companies have adopted similar measures. Procter and Gamble guarantee forty-eight weeks' employment in a year. If we totaled all the workers who have substantial protection against joblessness through the planning of some employer, there might, at the outside, be several hundred thousand. But there are in the nation about 30,000,000 wage and salary earners. Unemployment crises have been arriving on an average every three and one-third years. If, in each succeeding one, 100,000 additional workers should be thus protected, and if in the meantime there were no expansion of working forces, we might perhaps arrive at a fairly complete system of unemployment insurance by the year 2930. Impatient radicals that we are, we should like to see a more rapid approach to general relief.

This estimate may, of course, be unfair. Imitation of the industrial leaders may be an accelerating process. We may, before the next depression arrives, see other companies tumbling over each other to follow—companies like United States Steel, Ford and General Motors, industries like the railroads, the coal mines, the cotton mills. We may see this, but somehow we doubt it. Not many re-

sponsible executives are really much concerned about the problem; it is difficult to understand how a measure of this sort can add to productive efficiency or yield an extra dollar of profit. And many employers are not close enough to stability of operation so that they would dare to attempt it alone. The fund would have to be too great. But suppose all the large employers were promptly to adopt a similar scheme. What about the men and women permanently laid off from a given payroll because of increased mechanical efficiency or a shrinking demand for the product of the industry in question? What about the employees of bankrupt companies which go out of business? What about the millions of workers for small concerns which do not have intelligent employment policies or the means to carry them out?

Some say that the way to deal with unemployment is to prevent it rather than to compensate the unemployed. As a long-time policy, this is sound. But for the next fifty years at least, real prevention is a chimerical ideal. As Franklin D. Roosevelt pointed out at the conference of Governors, measures which have been undertaken, like the expansion of public works, may decrease the number of unemployed, but they do not prevent general depressions. A few individual concerns which are fortunately situated may stabilize their production, but not all can do so under our competitive system of private enterprise. When we have built up a planned economy, and have learned to operate it perfectly, we may just possibly be able to eliminate unemployment. But that goal is a long way off. In the meantime there is no real alternative between preventing unemployment and compensating the unemployed. There is no reason why we cannot do our best in both directions.

Nor is there any reason why we should at the same time praise plans like that of the General Electric as "insurance" and denounce the proposal for governmental action as "the dole." If one is insurance, the other is also. Our present methods of haphazard relief are true doles, because the funds are derived from charity or from emergency appropriations. But, as Governor Roosevelt stated, a well conceived public plan would be worked out on an actuarial basis; it would derive its funds from regular contributions by workers and employers just as the General Electric does, and possibly from the state also, in order to cover those sections of industry where the risk of lay-off would inevitably be too great to be met out of the proceeds of the industry itself. It is true that in Great Britain and certain other countries which have adopted unemployment insurance, post-war depressions have been so severe and long continued that the regular funds have been insufficient and additional relief has been provided out of emergency appropriations. This is the source of the word "dole." But this result is not a necessary consequence of an insurance plan in the case of the government any more than it is in the case of a private company. Unless we anticipate industrial difficulties as severe as those of Great Britain after the War, we need not worry about the adequacy of the normal funds. And it is absurd to attribute Great Britain's depression to her unemployment insurance.

What is really involved in the attitude typified by The Chicago Journal of Commerce is a stiff-necked support of industrial feudalism. The private rulers of industry, according to this feeling, are self-sufficient and all-competent. They are not to be deprived of any of their power, either by the development of a non-governmental group capable of challenging it, such as a trade-union movement, or by the action of a government which represents public policy. It is a good thing to relieve unemployment if a privately owned corporation can and will do so, but it is far better not to relieve unemployment than to teach the workers to look to the political government for any aid or support. Almost anything industry does is right; almost anything government does is wrong, unless it merely enhances the power and prestige of industry. This feeling, which is very influential in the United States, makes us largely dependent on the favor of the lords of our industrial principalities. The fundamental question is, assuming as they do sole responsibility for our welfare, how long are they going to be able to maintain their prestige? Will they move rapidly enough and effectively enough against the serious flaws in the existing order so that people will continue to be satisfied with their regime? Power and responsibility have never in the world's history been long divorced.

## The Free Speech Barometer

WRITING in last week's New Republic, John Dos Passos offered evidence to show that there is at present a serious return of anti-Red hysteria in the United States. His conclusions are confirmed by the Civil Liberties Union, which has just published its report on conditions in the United States in 1929 and the early part of 1930—a grim book, and one which ought to make any conscientious citizen ashamed. The Union points out that the first months of the present year have produced a larger crop of court cases involving the suppression of civil liberty than were seen in any entire year since the Great War. There were only thirty-six such cases in all of 1929; there were 920 in the first three months of 1930. These cases were almost entirely based on the activities of Communists in connection with public demonstrations against unemployment, or with left-wing strikes. In both instances, of course, the increase in activity is directly connected with the present hard times.

Attempting to survey the present general degree of freedom in America, the Union finds no easy generalization possible. Repressive laws have been made worse during the past fifteen months. There has been no improvement in the unfair treatment

meted out to Negroes. The record of the courts, all the way up to and including the Supreme Court, has been a bad one during this period. On the other hand, the Union's officials find that their work is being conducted in a somewhat better atmosphere: "Public opinion is on the whole more alert to defend civil liberties and to oppose repression. More newspapers speak out against repressive tactics. The Civil Liberties Union gets increasing support for its campaigns and views. . . . The defensive organizations of those whose rights are attacked are alert and on the whole stronger." The Ku Klux Klan, for the first time in recent years, is no longer an important agency of repression, the chief groups now engaged in these activities being, in descending order of importance, the American Legion, public schools, the D. A. R., the fundamentalists and the chambers of commerce. Lynchings in 1929 continued at the record low level of 1928, with only eleven as compared with the sixty or seventy of a decade ago. (But 1930 has started off so badly, with a series of tragedies in Texas, that this year's total will probably be much higher.)

Thirty-two states still have laws against "criminal syndicalism" or sedition, and these laws are beginning to be used again after having been in abeyance for the past six years. Of the other sixteen states, all but five are in the South, and have old laws, passed during Reconstruction days, which forbid "incitement to insurrection and rebellion." It is under one of these laws that the state of Georgia is trying to have a group of Communists put to death, as Mr. Dos Passos told in his article. Twenty-eight states have laws prohibiting the public display of the red flag, all of which were passed when the anti-Red hysteria was at its height in 1919. In ten states Negroes are disfranchised by one technicality or another, are segregated in schools and otherwise, and are forbidden to marry whites. The last-named restriction exists in every one of the forty-eight states except seventeen, all of which are in the North. In twelve states the reading of the Bible in the public schools is required by law, and in twenty-four others there is no restriction against it. There are still the famous three states—Tennessee, Arkansas and Mississippi—in which the teaching of evolution in state-supported schools is prohibited. Under federal law, 1,500 persons convicted of violating the espionage law during the War continue to be denied all civil rights. President Hoover has refused to act in their behalf, or even to receive a delegation favoring such action.

In the news of the past eighteen months, the Union finds several items which it lists as definite gains. Customs officials may no longer bar foreign literature which they regard as obscene, but such cases will now go before a federal judge and a jury. Judge Thacher of the New York federal court ruled that membership in the Communist party does not make an alien liable to deportation. Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett was vindicated by the United States Court of Appeals, her pamphlet, "The Sex Side of Life," being held not obscene. The Federal Law Enforcement Commission appointed a special committee to consider "official lawlessness." The Union lists on the other side of the ledger the cases growing out of the textile strikes in Gastonia and Marion, N. C., and Elizabethton, Tenn. There is also the Supreme Court ruling that Rosika Schwimmer, a pacifist, might not become an American citizen. Tom Mooney and the Centralia victims have remained in jail, five Ohio Communists were convicted under the state sedition law, and numerous other prosecutions of the same character were started.

In so far as the present wave of intolerance is due to labor troubles growing out of hard times, it may be expected to diminish with the return of better business—though textiles, coal and some other industries are likely to remain exceptions to prosperity in the future as they have been in the past. But in any case, the long view seems to be toward steadily increasing class conflict and presumably toward greater violations of civil liberties. In such a condition, the attitude which liberals ought to take is clear. They should fight to have every state criminal-syndicalism law, every other political restriction on freedom of discussion and belief, wiped off the statute books. All attempts by officials to break up meetings of Communists or otherwise to interfere with their legitimate activities should be resisted. The fact that the Communists are opposed to free speech for their opponents, and that Russia is today about as muzzled as Italy, furnishes no justification for repression. Even the conservative, if he is intelligent, ought to support freedom on grounds of prudence, because the more revolutionary a speaker is, the better he thrives on persecution. And those of us who assume that this nation is libertarian in principle ought to act according to our standards rather than according to those of the dictatorships we dislike. A liberal political order which cannot stand abuse from a handful of critics cannot be protected by courts and police. If it must abandon its liberalism in order to silence those who accuse it of injustice, it is defeated in any case.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK

*EDITORS*

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG

*CONTRIBUTING EDITORS*

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

# Radio for Robots

"CONSUMPTION," said Adam Smith, "is the sole end and purpose of all production; and the interest of the producer ought to be attended to only so far as it may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer. The maxim is so perfectly self-evident that it would be absurd to attempt to prove it." But to insist upon it was not absurd even in his day, and has become peremptory in ours. For a system which leaves the producer in ever increasing control both of the distribution of purchasing power and the pricing of commodities is bound to land the consumer in a position where his only choice is between passive or active rebellion. The new feudalism, not less than the old, merits Smith's castigation: "All for ourselves, and nothing for other people, seems, in every age of the world, to have been the vile maxim of the masters of mankind." The main difference is that the new is going to be far harder to displace. The serf at least knew who were his masters.

There are signs, none the less, that the new masters are not altogether easy in their minds. The present breakdown of the consumer will probably be got over: the poor devil will be doped with doles, development schemes and "consumers' credit" sufficiently for him to play his part as a small but essential cog in the machine for a few years longer. The real trouble is that he may suspect there is something radically wrong with him, and blame the system for it. Hence, the elaborate efforts of our economic masters, these last few years, to maintain the illusion that the whole business is run for the consumer's benefit, and that no interference on his behalf by his supposed representatives is either necessary or feasible. The efforts of the public utilities in this direction have probably aroused more skepticism than conviction. Now comes the radio industry, with a revised version of the gospel and a whole hatful of miracles. The following specimen deserves careful examination.

On June 1, 1929, Major-General J. C. Harbord addressed to the readers of The Saturday Evening Post a touching complaint of the ingratitude of the American public toward corporations in general and the Radio Corporation, of which he is president, in particular. Why, he asked, should not the public be content to accept the character of the directors as "a guarantee of the corporation's conformity to law, of its corporate integrity, of its collective patriotism and sincere desire for the welfare of our country and of our people?" Most of all, General Harbord suggested, should the Radio Corporation of America be credited with "the lofty ideal of the glory and honor of our country" in view of the circumstances of its origin. It was, we are told, at the direct request of President Wilson that the General Electric called off its negotiations with the British Marconi Company for the sale of the Alexanderson alternator; and as a solution to the question of how the General Electric Company might realize on its interests in that and other devices, "Mr. Young, with the sincere and whole-hearted coöperation of the national administration of the time, took the final steps which culminated in the formation of the Radio Corporation of America. The Navy Department, which has always shown a live interest in the development of the radio, was particularly active in these negotiations."

This account of the immaculate conception of the Radio Corporation of America has more than once been challenged. Indeed, Senator Wheeler, during the hearings on the Couzens bill, irreverently called it "the cheapest kind of advertising bunk." There is no evidence to connect Mr. Wilson with the formation of the Radio Corporation of America, and some to support the contention that he favored government monopoly. The original plan for an American-owned radio company, in which the Navy Department should have a direct interest, failed to materialize. Secretary Daniels declared himself in favor of government ownership of radio, and doubted his power to sanction the scheme; the War Department was reported hostile. Accordingly, General Electric went ahead with the flotation of Radio Corporation of America, absorbing the American Marconi Company en route. Westinghouse also went ahead, controlling and developing the International Radio Telegraph Company as a potential competitor of the General Electric system. In this aim it is stated to have had the support of some members of the Navy Department.

Westinghouse in 1920 made a pioneer appearance in the commercial broadcasting field through KDKA of Pittsburgh. But its efforts to meet the growing demand for receiver sets were hampered by the patent controls of General Electric, American Telephone and Telegraph and the Radio Corporation of America. The eventual result was that International Radio Telegraph was absorbed by Radio Corporation of America, and Westinghouse brought into the network of exclusive cross-licensing agreements—an arrangement concluded, contrary to the usual practice, without prior notification to the Navy Department. At the close of 1922 a majority stock control of the Radio Corporation of America lay with General Electric (25.7 percent), Westinghouse (20.6 percent), and American Telephone and Telegraph (4.1 percent), and United Fruit (3.7 percent), other companies absorbed or included in the licensing system accounting for most of the remainder. The stockholdings of the Amer-

ican Telephone and Telegraph and United Fruit companies were subsequently given up, though these concerns remain parties to the cross-licensing agreement: an arrangement ensuring mutual protection of their, and the Radio Corporation's, interests in communications. The Radio Corporation of America thus emerged in a dual capacity. It is the focal point of a huge network of patent agreements, both domestic and international, controlling the use in broadcasting, transmission and manufacture of more than 3,500 patents. It is also the sales agent of the General Electric Company and Westinghouse, under contract to place 60 percent of its manufacturing with the former and 40 percent with the latter. For this apparatus—radio sets and tubes—it pays these companies on a basis of cost plus 20 percent, in addition to the dividends they receive as its principal owners. Its interests further extend, through subsidiary or allied concerns, into ship-to-shore equipment and communication, international communications, sound-film equipment, the entertainment business, automobile and other specialized forms of radio, radio telephony and television, music copyrights and other incidental activities.

A regrouping of these interests is now in process, as part of which the Radio Corporation is to take over the manufacturing and allied activities of its two principal constituents in the field of radio. The R. C. A.-Victor Corporation and the Radiotron Company, now jointly owned by the three, will pass into the sole ownership of the Radio Corporation of America; and in exchange for this and the manufacturing rights surrendered, the electrical companies will receive 90 percent of a new stock issue equal in sum to the present common stock. The additional capitalization, at current values, will bring Radio Corporation of America into the billion-dollar class, and will, of course, greatly enlarge the control of the two main holders. Reasons for the step are variously stated as a need for closer control of production—there has admittedly been overproduction of some lines—and for reintegration of the patent controls. Among the consequences President Sarnoff anticipates a "material increase" in earnings per share, and an "ultimate" reduction in costs to the public.

As a sales agent, the Radio Corporation of America's crowning achievement is the formation of the National Broadcasting Company—owned 50 percent by Radio Corporation of America, 30 percent by General Electric Company, and 20 percent by Westinghouse. Station WEAF, purchased for $1,000,000 from American Telephone and Telegraph in 1926, was made the foundation of the famous blue and red network, which now includes some seventy-three stations on a coast-to-coast circuit and 32,500 miles of specially built telephone wires. For the lease of the telephone systems the National Broadcasting Company paid more than $3,000,000 to American Telephone and Telegraph last year. The great majority of the stations are independently owned, and owe their inclusion in the network to their location and technical capacity.

The fact that the National Broadcasting Company is able to earn a profit on its own operations reveals one of the cleverest feats of salesmanship in all history. Its superb organization placed at the service of advertisers has resulted in the firm establishment of radio advertising as an element in American business; whence it follows that the greater part of the cost of selling radio receiving sets is unloaded on the vendors of toothpaste, ginger ale, shoes, clothing, clocks, coal and all the other commodities whose praises fill the air—fill it over 75 percent of the "time" the National Broadcasting Company has for sale.

This happy result, with all its implications for the dissemination of culture in America, is fully concurred in by the Federal Radio Commission. "A broadcasting station engaged in general public service has ordinarily a claim to preference over a propaganda station." The term "propaganda," the Commission is careful to point out, is not used in a derogatory sense: it merely includes "every school of thought, religious, political, social and economic." "In rare cases it is possible to combine a general public-service station and a high-class religious station in a division of time which will approximate a well rounded program. In other cases religious stations must accept part-time on inferior channels. . . . Advertising must be accepted for the present as the sole means of support for broadcasting." One would like to know exactly what President Hoover thinks of this. "Radio communication," said he to the House committee on the Couzens bill, "is not to be considered as merely a business carried on for private gain, for public advertisements or for entertainment of the curious. It is a public concern impressed with the public trust and to be considered primarily from the standpoint of public interest." A very beautiful feature, by the way, of National Broadcasting Company policy is the current formation of a subsidiary to be known as the Radio Music Corporation, which, in conjunction with the publishing houses of Feist and Fisher, "will secure control of a sufficient number of composers so that it can dictate satisfactory terms for the vast amount of musical composition necessary to commercial broadcasting." The analogy with a certain scene of "Beggar on Horseback" is worth pondering.

So much for the creation of the demand for radio sets. In its efforts to meet that demand, the Radio Corporation of America, though highly successful from its own point of view, has from time to time encountered the lack of appreciation of which General Harbord complained. Its altruistic and patriotic purposes were impugned as long ago as January, 1924, by the Federal Trade Commission. An (alleged) investigation of (alleged) monopolistic practices went on until the close of 1928, when the Commission somewhat tardily decided

that it was without power to investigate Sherman Act violations and turned the matter over to the Department of Justice. Still unappreciative, the Trade Commission recently issued another complaint about alleged "full-line forcing": specifically, the purchase of Radio Corporation of America tubes as a condition of the grant of licenses to manufacture. A motion to set aside this complaint was overruled by the Commission on March 6, and the Commission now awaits the outcome of court proceedings independently started on the same charge.

The altruism of the Radio Corporation of America was strikingly illustrated by a statement of Mr. Grigsby, of the Grigsby-Grunow Company, makers of the Majestic set, before the Couzens committee on January 17, 1930. Mr. Grigsby had paid to date $5,000,000 to Radio Corporation of America at the usual rate of 7½ percent on gross value of the set—gross including, until recently redefined, both the cabinets and the packing cases. "We did not pay this royalty because we considered these patents worth such a royalty," said Mr. Grigsby. "We did not believe we needed these patents, and none of them had been adjudicated. But the radio combine had so terrorized the industry and had so intimidated the dealers and jobbers everywhere that they were afraid to handle what they called 'unlicensed' sets. Our bankers said they would not finance us unless we took out a license."

Another dent in the halo of the Radio Corporation of America was administered by Mr. Joseph Pierson, president of Press Wireless, Inc. The Radio Commission had refused to sanction the leasing of broadcasting channels by one party to another, as telegraph wires are leased to the press, on the ground that "the medium of radio communication is not created or constructed by communication companies." On the other hand, the Commission did not see how every newspaper could be assigned to its own band on the limited total allotment of short-wave frequencies. It therefore suggested the formation of a general public-utility corporation to serve all the press, to which it would be willing to assign a group of wave-lengths both domestic and international. Some five newspapers —not without opposition from others—accordingly started Press Wireless, and approached the Radio Corporation of America for licenses for apparatus. The terms they were offered, according to Mr. Pierson, included an outright refusal to sell, a demand that they operate as a profit-earning, not a mutual, concern, in order to get a license, that they sacrifice any and all patents to Radio Corporation of America, that they give exclusive-use privileges as required, that they pay over to Radio Corporation of America 5 percent of gross receipts plus cost of apparatus manufactured by General Electric Company, plus 45 percent profit for Radio Corporation of America.

If in all this the Radio Corporation of America has departed somewhat from the navy-blue idealism of Admiral Bullard, there is evidence, none the less, that it has not ceased to be conscious of its patriotic mission. Its officers and directors must, by the charter, be American citizens, and elaborate precautions, including a right of challenge by the Navy Department, are taken against foreign stock ownership exceeding 20 percent. Similar good offices were extended to clarify the growing confusion in the South American field. The four principal national interests—American (Radio Corporation of America), British, French, German—were brought into a trustee agreement, transferring use rights to a board of which each group nominated two members, the ninth, a chairman, being an independent nominee of the Radio Corporation of America, and having veto power. This board sanctions, supervises and retains a voting control of national companies formed to conduct international communications. Further, in the reciprocal sale-and-use arrangements concluded with the British interests, British possessions in the western hemisphere are excluded from British territory. The Radio Corporation of America, in its solicitude for the American people, went even so far as to protect them against their own government. A common stipulation of the licensing agreements provides that if the Radio Corporation of America be taken over by the government, except during war or national emergency, all the rights and licenses revert automatically to their former owners. A similar provision respecting the British government appears in the agreements with the British companies. Evidently somebody at Radio Corporation of America headquarters had been reading Marx!

Into the complex field of international communications this article cannot enter. But so far as Radio Corporation of America is concerned, the main domestic issue may be briefly outlined. The Federal Radio Act (1927-28) explicitly prohibits mergers of radio and wire companies in accordance with the time-honored maxims of individualism and competition. Other countries—particularly England —have not so viewed the matter. The British government has sponsored the formation of a communications merger which includes both wire and wireless services. The Radio Corporation of America is now seeking an abrogation of the prohibition in the Radio Act in order to permit of a merger between its international subsidiary (Radio Corporation of America Communications, Inc.) and the International Telephone and Telegraph. The terms of the deal have been announced: Radio Corporation of America properties of an alleged value of $15,000,000 are to be taken over in exchange for stock variously valued at from $78,000,000 to $100,000,000. The merger is defended as necessary to meet British competition. Quoted figures do not altogether substantiate this alleged menace, which Mr. Carlton of the Western Union terms a "fantastic bogey." And Mr. Clarence Mackay of the Postal-Telegraph system (itself affiliated with International Telephone and Telegraph) lets the cat

out of the bag with a frank statement that the real purpose of the merger is to facilitate competition with Mr. Carlton. Meanwhile, various onlookers are wondering what will happen to communication rates if the deal goes through and the matter comes before federal courts on a valuation case.

Poor General Harbord! It is really too bad that his "proved servant of our country's greatness" should still be bothered with these various manifestations of ingratitude. No doubt it will emerge with a still brighter halo to reflect the gold on the admirals' caps. But, where, in the meantime, does democracy come in?

Democracy comes in—or perhaps we should say, goes out—with its tail between its legs, having got itself into a mess from which it cannot see any way of escape. So far as domestic broadcasting is concerned, it has the principle written into the Radio Act that the grant of licenses is subject to public interest, convenience and necessity. But the conception of public interest applied to what comes over the air is avowedly that of the advertising man, not that of the Radio Commission or any other body with public responsibility. Perhaps that is the American idea of public interest. No less a person than Mr. Lee de Forest, however, thinks that the popularity of radio is being destroyed by advertising. Mr. Aylesworth (president of the National Broadcasting Company) insists that the correct analogy for broadcasting is not the public utility—perish the thought!—but that part of the magazine-publishing business in which what the public gets by way of edification and entertainment is what the advertiser is willing to pay for. On the facts of the moment he is right; other nations have shown a different conception of what constitutes progress.

In the production end the patent situation is so extraordinarily involved that negative action by the government is, as Assistant Attorney-General O'Brian recently stated, very difficult, and positive action practically impossible. The Radio Corporation of America, altruistic to the last ditch, asserts in its motion for dismissal of the current Trade Commission complaint "that the corporation is in fact actually aiding its tube competitors by licensing them under its tube patents, and that there is no danger of a monopoly in the radio-tube field." But under these circumstances competition is made just about as expensive to the public as a monopoly would be. One witness before the Couzens committee hit the nail on the head by denouncing the patent law itself as the *fons et origo*. Certain it is that under the law and the transactions based on it, no necessary connection exists between the economic advantages obtained by patent controls and either the merits of the patent or the deserts of the original inventor. To invest every economic interest based on patents with public-utility status would be a logical analogy to the treatment of public utilities based on franchises; but nobody supposes that such action is even remotely possible. England has retained more control of her communications combine than is commonly supposed, and in radio-telephony the present government has insisted on operating its own two stations in competition with semi-private interest. The United States has no such checks on its economic masters. So long as competition is supposed to be the rule, and controlled monopoly the evil thing, regulatory commissions are reduced to the status of terriers yapping at the heels of the vested interests.

A conference of the radio division of the Department of Commerce and the Federal Radio Commission has recently been in progress at which, it was stated, the whole field was to be examined. It is certainly high time the fundamental principles of policy were overhauled. The Department of Justice has so far acted as if it were thoroughly unnerved by the complexity of the problem and the impressive array of legal talent at the service of the Radio Corporation of America. A reformulation of ends and means available might assist Mr. Mitchell in his declared intention of seeing the thing through.

There are apparently four basic elements in the problem: the status of radio-communication concerns, the question of monopoly in communications, the question of monopoly in manufacture and market control, and the patent law as the main instrument thereto.

As to the first, the Couzens bill proposes to put radio definitely into the category of common carriers along with wire communications. This is the very least that should be done, and in accordance with court decisions holding that wave assignments may not be leased or sold (though the International Telephone and Telegraph deal comes very near it), since the medium through which the business is done is not the creation of the operating concerns. How much control over broadcasting this would imply is doubtful; probably little more than at present. As to the second, the bill proposes to retain the present prohibition of wire and wireless mergers "where the effect is to substantially lessen competition." This seems to the writer doubtful policy. It is admitted that there are real impediments to the development of radio communication, both for public and press use, arising from this policy of separation. Efficiency would demand that the ultimate solution be along the lines of merger, perhaps monopoly, under strict government control if not ownership. The positive control of capitalization would, however, be a *sine qua non* of any such development.

As to the third—manufacturing monopoly or control—the Couzens bill proposes to get at part of the problem by empowering the Radio Commission to refuse a license to any concern that will not agree to lease or sell its apparatus to another in the field; in case of failure to agree on terms, the Commission to have power to determine the terms itself. How powerful a deterrent that would be would obviously depend on the value to the

monopolizing concern of a broadcasting license. It is a safe prediction that a good deal of manufacture would manage to steer clear of that kind of regulation; and it may also be said with some certainty that the Commission and the Department of Justice would have to hew their way through a jungle of camouflage to make the power effective even in cases where it should apply. Beyond that lies the general problem of the anti-trust laws, whose assumptions—based on the dogma of competition and the sufficiency of negative control—are entirely out of date. Revision is impossible without tackling the patent law. The government should undoubtedly have power, as Mr. Schuette maintained, to force shelved patents into use. In the writer's opinion, it should have more than that: it should have outright power to condemn when the monopoly granted stands in the way of public interest in essential industries. The monopoly of a patentee is in essence not different from the franchise to use a highway or a wave-length: it should be made contingent on the common good. The case is all the stronger when the actual scientific work is conducted by salaried employees of great corporations which automatically acquire a vested interest in the results.

The problem is emphatically one which cannot be dealt with by any mere reshuffling of legal techniques and ideas that have already proved inadequate. It demands new concepts and a new departure in policy. Said Mr. Hoover recently, "The question of monopoly in radio communication must be squarely met." Give a lead, Mr. President!

WILLIAM ORTON.

# India Rejects the Simon Report

ON NOVEMBER 26, 1927, an imperial mission headed by a talented jurist and composed of men representing the three main political parties of England was requested to take passage to India in order to bring to life a new constitutional plan for their Indian fellow-subjects. It was felt by those in authority that to include any Indians in the mission would be unwise, inasmuch as there was hardly a leading Indian who had not already committed himself to some definite point of view. And it was further pointed out that a commission composed of members of both houses of Parliament who had had no special experience with India could, going there without any preconceived ideas and with the sole object of learning India's problems, really help in framing the future constitution.

The remark hurled at American tourists—that no one can really understand India without a long residence in the country—was entirely forgotten and the British members without "preconceived ideas" sailed for Bombay. The blessings of the political leaders of Great Britain were showered on them.

When Sir John Simon, the head of the mission, and his colleagues—among whom were Lord Burnham, Baron Strathcona, Edward Cadogan, Esq., Colonel G. R. Lane Fox, Major C. R. Attlee and Vernon Hartshorn, Esq.—reached Bombay on February 3, 1928, they were received with huge placards, "Go back, Simon," and with black flags as a sign of mourning; business was completely suspended, the Stock Exchange closed, the shops of the city were shuttered and even the Indian-owned newspapers stopped publication—all as a protest against the composition of the Commission. These scenes were repeated more or less emphatically all over the country, and when receptions were tendered they were not participated in by the real representatives of nationalist India. Soon after the Commission landed, the Central Legislative Assembly officially expressed lack of confidence in it.

But, boycott or no boycott, the Commission continued its labors. It stayed for two months and went out for a second visit October 11, 1928, staying this time until April 13, 1929. It traversed the length and breadth of the land—all in all 21,000 miles—and took evidence about seventy-five days in various parts of the vast country. Its verdict is delivered in a summary of 409 pages and a report of recommendations of 344 pages, both volumes sprinkled with maps, statistical tables and footnotes and enriched with a valuable index. The memoranda submitted and extracts from evidence obtained are embodied in seventeen supplementary volumes. The cost of the whole to the British government was $700,000.

The question which now arises is whether the verdict of this imperial mission can serve as a basis of conciliation between Britain and the peoples of India, or whether the Commission considered the problem merely in terms of details.

Has the Commission considered the establishment of a Dominion form of self-government? Should India be governed by a Western parliamentary system, or does the Simon Commission advise the adoption of a typical Eastern constitution for India? What about the defense of the country? What machinery does the report devise for the administration of the provinces? And how about the Native States?

It is not necessary to go into a technical discussion of all the implications of the report. Here we deal merely with its principal recommendations.

Let it also be recalled that in October, 1929, Sir John Simon, presumably because of the boycott by nationalist India and in order to avoid an impasse, suggested that a conference with representatives of all parties including the princes be held in London (now scheduled for October, 1930), and that the whole problem be discussed. And in November, 1929, the Viceroy declared that "the natural issue of India's constitutional progress . . . is the attainment of Dominion status." But later developments revealed that the government was not ready to arrange at this conference for the immediate granting of full self-government and the Gandhi followers replied in the spring of this year with their non-coöperation campaign.

Volume I of the report gives a general survey of the social, economic, religious and political conditions of the country; deals with the constitutional structure, the administrative and judicial system and the working of the 1919 reforms; treats the system of public finances and the growth of education. But to "Public Opinion in India" is devoted the space of just six pages!

Speaking on the whole the survey is impartial enough, but it reveals neither real understanding nor deep probing into the problems facing the Indian people. It shows that the Commissioners, in spite of all their visits and learning, had no contact with those who know the pulse of public opinion. This is easily accounted for by the boycott inflicted upon them by the nationalists of various schools.

The general survey reads more like an academic dissertation than the life story of hundreds of millions of souls. We need hardly quarrel with its authors because it is as dry as dust. That is, after all, to be expected of official reports. But we might have anticipated a real analysis of the whole problem, considered in the light of what is happening in India today. In reality the Commissioners have paid no attention to what is happening there now and are priding themselves on that fact.

Describing the passive-resistance campaign of 1919, the Commission writes, "It was part of the pledge that Mr. Gandhi's followers took that they should abstain from violence to person or property; but, as the excitement grew, this obligation was forgotten and the movement developed in March, 1919, into a widespread outburst of violence, principally in the Punjab and Gujerat, and culminated in the tragedy of Jalianwala Bagh in Amritsar." This seems to insinuate that the people of Amritsar were responsible for the massacre. The Commissioners apparently did not recall that the House of Commons approved the Secretary of State's censure of the general who directed the firing into the heart of the crowd.

This much for Volume I. Before considering the recommendations of the Simon Commission embodied in Volume II, let us review briefly the scheme of government in India today.

Under the present charter, British India is divided into fifteen provinces, nine of which are under separate governors, each assisted by an executive council, ministers, and a legislature the majority of whose members are elected. The remaining six administrative units are directly administered by the central government of India through chief commissioners. The "superintendence and direction and control of the civil and military government of India" rests with the Governor-General and his Cabinet of seven members, at least three of whom must be Indians. Under this system, less than 6,500,000 of the 247,000,000 inhabitants of British India are enfranchised.

Another feature of the 1919 reforms, still operating today, is the division of the electorate into general and special constituencies so as to ensure representation for minorities. The special constituencies include landholders, universities, chambers of commerce, mill-owners' associations, rural and urban non-Mohammedan representation, rural and urban seats for the Mohammedan population and for Europeans. This system gives Europeans and other minorities a representation out of all proportion to their numbers. In the Central Legislative Assembly, for instance, 25 of the 145 seats are occupied by Europeans.

The outstanding characteristic of the 1919 constitution is the system known as "dyarchy." This applies to the government of the provinces and divides the administration into two distinct spheres, the "transferred" and "reserved" labors of the government. These provincial councils are of dual character. The part controlling the "reserved" subjects—namely police, justice, land revenue, forests (except in Bombay) and water supply, including drainage and irrigation—consists of the Governor and the executive councils, which are half Indians and half British officials independent of the legislature. The "transferred" subjects—namely, local self-government and the departments of education, local industries, industrial research, public works, agriculture, forests (Bombay), medicine and excise—are administered by the Governor and the ministers, if possible with the consent of the legislature. The Central Legislature has no real power.

Now, let us see what the Simon Commission recommends. In dealing with the mechanism for advance toward the future constitution of India, in Volume II, the Commissioners point out that the reforms of 1919 "did not make provision for a steady evolution towards an ultimate objective," and that "the object now to be aimed at is a reformed constitution which will not necessarily require revision at stipulated intervals, but which provides opportunities for natural development."

The principle is laid down by Sir John Simon and his colleagues that the ultimate constitution of India must be federal, "for it is only in a federal constitution that units differing so widely in constitution as the provinces and the [Native] States

can be brought together while retaining internal autonomy." Dyarchy is to be abolished, and the provincial administration as a whole is to rest with a council the members of which will be chosen by the Governor. But the Governor will, under certain circumstances, have power to take action without or against the advice of his ministry. Moreover, the Governor is to have authority to include in his ministry one or more persons who are not elected members of the legislature. By this loophole he can, and probably will, appoint British officials for such offices as land revenue and public safety. Provision is made that the franchise should be extended to about three times the number now exercising it, and that the Northwest-Frontier Province and Baluchistan should have provincial assemblies.

Coming to the "Federal Assembly" (which will replace the present Central Legislative Assembly), the Commissioners recommend indirect election through the provincial assemblies. This is urged not only on the ground of mechanical convenience, but mainly as a method which will represent the provinces at the center. The powers of the Federal Assembly are not only not enlarged, but are even diminished. It is suggested that "the army should fall within the responsibilities of the Governor-General, advised by the Commander-in-Chief, as representing the Imperial authorities, instead of being part of the responsibilities of the Government of India in relation to the Central Legislature." And this is suggested ostensibly, not to deprive Indians of control of military affairs, but as "means by which the obstacle to progress which the control of the army in India prevents might be mitigated"!

The authors of the Simon Report recommend that a permanent council be organized to consider the problems of mutual interest to British India and the Native States. But it is doubtful whether the important native states will send representatives to such an assembly.

If the Simon Report were put into effect the provinces would have a little more elasticity in administering their problems. The governors would have just as many powers as under the present act, and in some ways even more. The Central Legislature, far from being the basis of the federal parliament, would resemble a Russian Duma, but with more limited rights. On the whole the new scheme would have very little in common with what we call a constitutional government.

Just before the Simon Commission was appointed, all the nationalist groups of India—with the exception of the Mohammedans—agreed on a constitution for the country. This was drafted by the most eminent jurists and political leaders whom India has produced. It is known as the Nehru report. In considering the recommendations of the Simon mission it is well to take a glance at this.

The Simon Commissioners, as we have seen, recommend the adoption of measures which would triple the electorate, enfranchising about nineteen million in place of the six and a half million who now have the vote. They approve the continuance of communal representation. The authors of the Nehru report urge the abolition of communal representation and the enfranchisement of the entire adult population as alone compatible with self-government.

The Simon report avoids the very words "Dominion status" and considers the problem primarily as a matter of administration. The Nehru report, on the other hand, formulates a constitution based on the assumption of responsible self-government. But one hardly need go into further comparisons between the two plans.

Whatever the defects of the Nehru scheme, it has the merit of being drafted by Indians of recognized ability, like Sir Tej Sapru and Pandit Motilal Nehru, and could serve as a better basis for discussion of what the future government of India should be than the product submitted by Sir John Simon and his colleagues.

Judging from all the latest information, hostility to the Simon report is growing daily. The Gandhi Nationalists repudiate it in its entirety. The Moderates are calling special attention to the blow struck at Dominion status by the provision that the army should be taken away entirely from Indian control. The Sikhs, with a population of nearly two and a half million, are indignant over being alloted only 2 percent of representation in the Federal Assembly, as against 10 percent for the European element of about 150,000. Hostility extends even to the ranks of the Moslems, who, during this crisis, were counted as supporters of the government.

Moreover, The New York Times correspondent wires from Simla on June 26, "The British find it depressing that up to the moment of this writing not a single ruler of an Indian state, or for that matter a single Indian minister, has ranged himself on the side of the report." Meanwhile the Nationalists are organizing new hospitals to take care of their wounded and the police are busy improvising new jails. The government is strongly reinforcing ordinances to throttle the non-coöperation movement and in Madras they are even forbidding the wearing of the Gandhi caps.

The adoption of the Simon Commission recommendations presents a sure way of adding India to the "lost colonies" of the British Empire.

Nevertheless, the situation could be saved even now. It is possible that a visit of Mr. Wedgwood Benn to India to hold conferences on a new basis with the political leaders of the country, the release of political prisoners and a promise that the round-table conference, while it could not decide immediately for Dominion status, would discuss the date when it would be put into operation, might help to save India for the British commonwealth of nations.

SAVEL ZIMAND.

# Laid Off

"IT COSTS money to buy food and I'm not earning money." Dan Mullin pushed his plate away and left the table. His sister followed, and the work of reassuring him started again.

Three months before, Dan had been driving a delivery truck for a large newspaper in Chicago. He had worked for the same firm for years and he liked his job. His imagination touched it with significance, and in his own way he thought of himself as part of an organization which brought the news to people. He gave his loyalty to the job and in turn had a sense of belonging. Then his paper merged with another, and, without a day's notice, Dan was dismissed.

He started off hopefully enough to look for another job. Then, for three months, he returned each night without work. He worried constantly because his sisters were supporting him as well as their crippled father. At last he refused to eat and his sisters called in a doctor. The doctor sent Dan at once to a hospital where he stayed for months receiving treatment for a mental breakdown.

We who are employed think of unemployment, if at all, largely in terms of physical deprivation, but to one who has known men and woman intimately when they are out of work, the effects on the human spirit seem even more devastating. It is a very unusual family whose economic situation is the only thing impaired by long periods of unemployment. This has been borne in upon us the farther we have gone in the case study which the National Federation of Settlements has been making of the effects of unemployment on families and individuals in the neighborhoods of thirty cities.

The story of Anthony and Mary M—— comes from Rochester. A few years ago Anthony and Mary M—— were busy and happy and felt that life had treated them well. They loved their house, their babies and each other. Anthony worked steadily for ten years in a shoe factory. During that time he did so well that when his first baby was born his wife could have a private nurse. He "always wanted her to have the best." At the end of the ten years they had partly paid for their house; it was comfortably furnished, and there was money in the bank. Then the factory in which Anthony worked was sold to another firm. The new owners came from another city and brought their own workmen with them. Anthony lost his job. He started his search to find work in other shoe factories; then, as he failed in this and his savings began to go, he tried for any kind of job. Payments came due on their house and they sold their furniture and wedding presents to meet them. But before Anthony found a job they had lost their house. When he did get work, it was at street cleaning. Glad to get anything, he worked at this until one day he was brought home with a sunstroke. When he was well he started the search again, but "he was discouraged all the time now," his wife said. "And," she continued, "he began to drink a little and get ugly with me; then came a night when he hit the baby. And he that loved the baby so! He felt so dreadful when he knew what he'd done. It doesn't seem like we're the same family."

In studying the economic makeshifts to which people turn when the wages stop, we find families following the same lines. First, cash savings are used up, insurance policies lapse, jewelry and clothes are pawned, furniture is sold. Then come unpaid bills at the grocer's and possible moves to poorer neighborhoods, and—what means most in discouragement to the family—often the loss of a house partly paid for. All along this line of march the mother is generally working or looking for work and the family is living on a semi-starvation diet.

We didn't know that one of the fathers in our Philadelphia neighborhood was out of work until we wondered why his small son's legs grew thin. The man was a roofer, and for four months his family of nine had lived on the $7 which fifteen-year-old Joe made as errand boy in a drug store. This had been supplemented by $3.80 for a day's work when Mr. Raymond shoveled snow for the city, and $10 which he had earned by roofing the house of a man in his old firm. "He's always walking or looking," said his wife. "The places are so far apart that his feet get sore. He's been everywhere—the day shifts and the night shifts. We had to put cotton in the heels of his shoes. Sometimes he don't know where he's walking. He's been back so often that they hold up their hands when they see him coming.

"Sometimes he gets awful cranky, but when he's working he's contented-like; comes home, has his supper, and takes the kids for a walk over the bridge, and then back and he's to bed and asleep. When he's earning I can just manage, but when he's out things go back. First I stop on the damp wash, then on the food, then the rent goes behind. We hated to have Joe go to work because his father wanted him to get a good trade, but not with the sheet-metal business because their work's unsteady. I've got a brother in sheet-metal work and he's been out of work since Christmas—just little odd jobs here and there. You've got to have that pay envelope every week or the children don't eat. You just can't manage with odd jobs and a family."

After reading the testimony gathered by the settlements, one no longer cherishes the idea that anyone who really wants a job can find one. As Mrs. Dever said of her husband: "He ain't one to pick his job nor don't lay his own self off. He'd take anything. He worked seven years in the mill as a dyer before it closed down, and that was last October, seven months ago, and he ain't had a job since. And it ain't for not looking, for the feet's walked off him. He comes home nights and just sits and soaks his feet. Sometimes this winter it's been so bad I thought it was better not to take the wear off his shoes, but he goes just the same. He says there's always the chance he might get something. I'm so glad there's only three children. Fanny is only four, so she don't eat so much, but John and Isabel they run around so they get hungry. Their aunt owns this house and so we've had it rent free all winter—and she helps us out with food, too. She's got a big family of her own, but her husband has always worked steady, so they can get along."

In considering today's unemployment, it is not often thought of in its relation to the next generation. But as you come to know the families of the unemployed, it sometimes seems that they feel a deeper resentment against their inability to make plans for the future than they do against their immediate sufferings.

I remember one mother whom I saw in Columbus, Georgia, whose husband was in charge of a section of "news butchers." He had worked for eighteen years with one firm and for seven with the next. He was laid off because, when buses were introduced in that section of the country, they didn't need as many news butchers on the trains. He had earned good wages; but after two years in which he had been unable to find a steady position, their savings were gone, they had sold their furniture, moved into a miserable neighborhood and had often had to go without food. But taking the children out of school was the greatest blow to them. Nothing could make up for that. They had wanted with a real passion to give their children more of a chance than they had had, and their whole lives had been planned around that desire.

Mrs. Carter herself is gentle and spoke to me without bitterness about it, but with a sense of bafflement: "This sure has ruined our plans and hopes, for our hearts' desire was to give the children a better chance than we got. Our children haven't given us a minute's worry for badness. Our ambition was to put them all through high school and then let them work for any more schoolin' if they wanted it. Yes, they do look pretty healthy, and it's wonderful that they do. I was great on fixing little things for them to eat, and they complained right smart when I first couldn't do it, but we talked to them and explained all the circumstances and now they realize. We have sent the oldest boy, seventeen, out to my brother's on oil lands in Texas. He was call boy at the railroad here, but he was the youngest, so when they started to cut down, his time was cut till he was only working a week or ten days a month. He started working at the railroad when he was fifteen and my husband first lost his job. My brother was sure he could get him work in Texas, but he hasn't so far. He says, though, he is sure things will open up in the spring.

"My Susie went to work over in the five-and-ten last fall when she was fourteen. Christmas they laid her off. They are trying her out in the telephone company now. She was that anxious to finish high school, she like to have cried her eyes out when she had to stop, and I guess it hurt me more than her.

"Simmons is our next one, and he's thirteen and was in 7 A. We had to take him out of school, too. He's workin' down at the drug store and he don't look as good as the rest, because the hours is pretty long. Every other day he goes at 8 in the morning and works till 10:30 at night. Then the other days he goes at 8:30 in the morning and works till 7. Maybe we'll be fixed so we can give schooling to the little ones, but you know how it is with a mother, she don't want none of them slighted."

Neighborhood workers are in a favorable position to bear witness to such less tangible consequences of unemployment. They know families over a period of years, and can make comparisons between their normal standards and those which idleness enforces upon them. For only men and women with good work records were included in our settlement inquiry; not cases in which illness or drunkenness were determining factors, but cases in which seasonal and market changes, mechanization and mergers played their parts. The study was entered upon during the prosperous winter of 1928-29, and so reflects what happens every year to some part of our population. It gives reality to the problem we shall still confront when this year's business recession is over, the problem which we must overcome by stabilization and some form of protection if the households and neighborhoods of our industrial centers are to have security. Ours are thumb-nail portraits of families wasted by hunger and physical strain, by broken morale, the wreckage of human relations and of hopes for children.

Rocco, a husky young factory hand of twenty-nine, is consumed with a desire to "do right by his family." No matter how worried he is, he always beams when he mentions his babies. "I've got a wonderful kid, five years old," he tells you. "I don't want him to go through what I've had. I know what hard sledding is. My father died when I was nine, and I went to work at eleven in a glass factory to help support my mother and little brother. At thirteen I was working on the railroad, and at sixteen did a man's work. I want to make something of my kid, but I can't even give him enough to eat now. And my wife's sick and I can't get her the medicine she needs. I've been out of

work for a month, and already I owe $50. Thank God the grocer trusts us, or I don't know what we'd do. When I can't break even on expenses I get down. Year before last I was out of work for months and got $300 in debt. Then I got a job and paid every penny off. That's why I haven't anything ahead. That pull was terrible. But my wife is a good manager; she can squeeze every cent out of a nickel. But now there's only a pint of milk a day for the baby and the boy, too. I'm twenty-nine years out of jail, and I don't want to do anything to get in it—ever—but sometimes I feel desperate. I get plenty of chances to go wrong, but I don't want to. I've got such a wonderful kid!"

HELEN HALL.

# How Much Freedom in New Schools?

## *Dr. John Dewey's Contribution to the Symposium "The New Education Ten Years After"*

IT IS NOT easy to take stock of the achievements of progressive schools in the last decade: these schools are too diverse both in aims and in mode of conduct. In one respect, this is as it should be: it indicates that there is no cut-and-dried program to follow, that schools are free to grow along the lines of special needs and conditions and so to express the variant ideas of innovating leaders. But there is more than is suggested by these considerations in the existing diversity. It testifies also to the fact that the underlying motivation is so largely a reaction against the traditional school that the watchwords of the progressive movement are capable of being translated into inconsistent practices.

The negative aspect of progressive education results from the conditions of its origin. Progressive schools are usually initiated by parents who are dissatisfied with existing schools and find teachers who agree with them. Often they express discontent with traditional education or locally available schools without embodying any well thought-out policies and aims. They are symptoms of reaction against formalism and mass regimentation; they are manifestations of a desire for an education at once freer and richer. In extreme cases they represent enthusiasm much more than understanding.

Their common creed is the belief in freedom, in esthetic enjoyment and artistic expression, in opportunity for individual development, and in learning through activity rather than by passive absorption. Such aims give progressive schools a certain community of spirit and atmosphere. But they do not determine any common procedure in discipline or instruction; they do not fix the subject matter to be taught; they do not decide whether the emphasis shall be upon science, history, the fine arts, different modes of industrial art, or social issues and questions. Hence the diversity of the progressive schools, and hence the great difficulty in appraising them. Adverse criticisms may be readily and often effectively answered on the ground that they do not apply to specific schools.

Strong and weak points go together; every human institution has the defects of its qualities. Colonel Francis W. Parker, more nearly than any other one person, was the father of the progressive educational movement, a fact all the more significant because he spent most of his educational life in public rather than private schools—first at Quincy, Massachusetts, and then at the Cook County Normal School in Englewood, Chicago. I do not know whether he used the phrase which has since come into vogue, "child-centered schools." One of his most frequent statements was that teachers had been teaching *subjects* when they should be teaching *children*. He engaged in aggressive warfare against the burden of ready-made, desiccated subject matter formulated and arranged from the adult point of view—in other words, against the stock in trade of the conventional curriculum. He pleaded for subject matter nearer to the experience and life of the pupils. He strove to throw off the yoke of fixed and uniform disciplinary measures. He introduced many things, innovations in his day, which are now almost commonplaces in the public schools which lay any claim to being modern—for example, the school assemblies conducted by the pupils themselves.

Even such an inadequate statement as the foregoing brings out an antithesis which has persisted to a considerable extent in the later movement of progressive education: that between the human and personal element represented by the pupils, the children, youth, and, on the other hand, the impersonal and objective factor—the subject matter of studies, the body of knowledge and organized and skilled accomplishment. In saying that the antithesis thus set up has resulted, upon the whole, in a lack of balance, I do not mean in any way to hold the work and influence of Colonel Parker responsible. I mean that the same reaction against dead, formal and external studies which affected his early reforms has continued to operate with his successors, and to produce a one-sided emphasis—that upon pupils at the expense of subject matter.

That there was need for the reaction, indeed for a revolt, seems to me unquestionable. The evils of the traditional, conventional school room, its almost complete isolation from actual life, and the deadly depression of mind which the weight of formal material caused, all cried out for reform. But rebellion against formal studies and lessons can be effectively completed only through the development of a new subject matter, as well organized as was the old—indeed, better organized in any vital sense of the word organization—but having an intimate and developing relation to the experience of those in school. The relative failure to accomplish this result indicates the one-sidedness of the idea of the "child-centered" school.

I do not mean, of course, that education does not center in the pupil. It obviously takes its start with him and terminates in him. But the child is not something isolated; he does not live inside himself, but in a world of nature and man. His experience is not complete in his impulses and emotions; these must reach out into a world of objects and persons. And until an experience has become relatively mature, the impulses do not even know what they are reaching out toward and for; they are blind and inchoate. To fail to assure them guidance and direction is not merely to permit them to operate in a blind and spasmodic fashion, but it promotes the formation of *habits* of immature, undeveloped and egoistic activity. Guidance and direction mean that the impulses and desires take effect through material that is impersonal and objective. And this subject matter can be provided in a way which will obtain ordered and consecutive development of experience only by means of the thoughtful selection and organization of material by those having the broadest experience—those who treat impulses and inchoate desires and plans as potentialities of growth through interaction and not as finalities.

To be truly self-centered is not to be centered in one's feelings and desires. Such a center means dissipation, and the ultimate destruction of any center whatever. Nor does it mean to be egoistically bent on the fulfillment of personal wishes and ambitions. It means rather to have a rich field of social and natural relations, which are at first external to the self, but now incorporated into personal experience so that they give it weight, balance and order. In some progressive schools the fear of adult imposition has become a veritable phobia. When the fear is analyzed, it means simply a preference for an immature and undeveloped experience over a ripened and thoughtful one; it erects into a standard something which by its nature provides no steady measure or tested criterion. In some recent articles in The New Republic I have argued that an adult cannot attain an integrated personality except by incorporating into himself the realities of the life-situations in which he finds himself. This operation is certainly even more necessary for the young; what is called "subject matter" represents simply the selected and organized material that is relevant to such incorporation at any given time. The neglect of it means arrest of growth at an immature level and ultimate disintegration of selfhood.

It is, of course, difficult to use words that are not open to misapprehension. There may be those who think that I am making a plea for return to some kind of adult imposition, or at least to ready-made and rather rigidly predetermined topics and sequences of study. But in fact many of the current interpretations of the child-centered school, of pupil initiative and pupil-purposing and planning, suffer from exactly the same fallacy as the adult-imposition method of the traditional school—only in an inverted form. That is, they are still obsessed by the personal factor; they conceive of no alternative to adult dictation save child dictation. What is wanted is to get away from every mode of personal dictation and merely personal control. When the emphasis falls upon having experiences that are educationally worth while, the center of gravity shifts from the personal factor, and is found within the developing experience in which pupils and teachers alike participate. The teacher, because of greater maturity and wider knowledge, is the natural leader in the shared activity, and is naturally accepted as such. The fundamental thing is to find the types of experience that are worth having, not merely for the moment, but because of what they lead to—the questions they raise, the problems they create, the demands for new information they suggest, the activities they invoke, the larger and expanding fields into which they continuously open.

In criticizing the progressive schools, as I have indicated already, it is difficult to make sweeping generalizations. But some of these schools indulge pupils in unrestrained freedom of action and speech, of manners and lack of manners. Schools farthest to the left (and there are many parents who share the fallacy) carry the thing they call freedom nearly to the point of anarchy. This license, however—this outer freedom in action—is but an included part of the larger question just touched upon. When there is genuine control and direction of experiences that are intrinsically worth while by objective subject matter, excessive liberty of outward action will also be naturally regulated. Ultimately it is the absence of intellectual control through significant subject matter which stimulates the deplorable egotism, cockiness, impertinence and disregard for the rights of others apparently considered by some persons to be the inevitable accompaniment, if not the essence, of freedom.

The fact that even the most extreme of the progressive schools do obtain for their pupils a degree of mental independence and power which stands them in good stead when they go to schools where formal methods prevail, is evidence of what might be done if the emphasis were put upon the rational freedom which is the fruit of objective knowledge and understanding. And thus we are brought to

the nub of the matter. To conduct a progressive school is much more difficult than to conduct a formal one. Standards, materials, methods are already at hand for the latter; the teacher needs only to follow and conform. Upon the whole, it is not surprising that, in history, science, the arts and other school "studies," there is still a lack of subject matter which has been organized upon the basis of connection with the pupils' own growth in insight and power. The time-span of progressive schools has been too short to permit very much to be accomplished. What may rightfully be demanded, however, is that the progressive schools recognize their responsibility for accomplishing this task, so as not to be content with casual improvisation and living intellectually from hand to mouth.

Again one needs to guard against misunderstanding. There is no single body of subject matter which can be worked out, even in the course of years, which will be applicable all over the country. I am not arguing for any such outcome; I know of nothing that would so completely kill progressive schools and turn them into another kind of formal schools, differentiated only by having another set of conventions. Even in the same school, what will work with one group of children will not "take" with another group of the same age. Full recognition of the fact that subject matter must be always changing with locality, with the situation and with the particular type of children is, however, quite consistent with equal recognition of the fact that it is possible to work out varied bodies of consecutive subject matter upon which teachers may draw, each in his own way, in conducting his own work. The older type of education could draw upon a body of information, of subject matter and skills which was arranged from the adult standpoint. Progressive education must have a much larger, more expansive and adaptable body of materials and activities, developed through constant study of the conditions and methods favorable to the consecutive development of power and understanding. The weakness of existing progressive education is due to the meager knowledge which anyone has regarding the conditions and laws of continuity which govern the development of mental power. To this extent its defects are inevitable and are not to be complained of. But if progressive schools become complacent with existing accomplishments, unaware of the slight foundation of knowledge upon they rest, and careless regarding the amount of study of the laws of growth that remains to be done, a reaction against them is sure to take place.

Such reference as has been made to the subject matter of a worth-while and continuously developing experience is too general to be of value in actual guidance. The discovery of such subject matter, which induces growth of skill, understanding and rational freedom, is the main question to be worked upon coöperatively. The question may be raised, however, of whether the tendency of progressive schools has not been to put emphasis upon things that make schooling more immediately enjoyable to pupils rather than upon things that will give them the understanding and capacity that are relevant to contemporary social life. No one can justly decry the value of any education which supplies additions to the resources of the inner life of pupils. But surely the problem of progressive education demands that this result be not effected in such a way as to ignore or obscure preparation for the social realities—including the evils—of industrial and political civilization.

Upon the whole, progressive schools have been most successful in furthering "creativeness" in the arts—in music, drawing and picture making, dramatics and literary composition, including poetry. This achievement is well worth while; it ought to assist in producing a generation esthetically more sensitive and alive than the older one. But it is not enough. Taken by itself it will do something to further the private appreciations of, say, the upper section of a middle class. But it will not serve to meet even the esthetic needs and defaultings of contemporary industrial society in its prevailing external expressions. Again, while much has been achieved in teaching science as an addition to private resources in intellectual enjoyment, I do not find that as much has been done in bringing out the relation of science to industrial society, and its potentialities for a planned control of future developments.

Such criticisms as these are not met by introducing exercises and discussions based on what are called "current events." What is needed is something which may indeed connect intellectually in time with what currently happens, but which takes the mind back of the happenings to the understanding of basic causes. Without insight into operative conditions, there can be no education that contains the promise of improved social direction.

This fact brings us back again to the enormous difficulty involved in a truly progressive development of progressive education. This development cannot be secured by the study of children alone. It requires a searching study of society and its moving forces. That the traditional schools have almost wholly evaded consideration of the social potentialities of education is no reason why progressive schools should continue the evasion, even though it be sugared over with esthetic refinements. The time ought to come when no one will be judged to be an educated man or woman who does not have insight into the basic forces of industrial and urban civilization. Only schools which take the lead in bringing about this kind of education can claim to be progressive in any socially significant sense.

JOHN DEWEY.

*This article by Dr. Dewey is the sixth and last contribution to the symposium, "The New Education Ten Years After."*—THE EDITORS.

# Washington Notes

A WEEK or so ago I expressed my conviction that despite his surface loyalty to the administration, the Honorable George Higgins Moses of New Hampshire, then just returned from Europe, would revert to type as a treaty scuttler. Subsequent developments have more than justified this belief. At this time—just a few days before the convening of the Senate in special session—Mr. Moses is at the game of scuttling the London Treaty, busier than a bird dog, furtive as a mole. The fact is that were it not for Mr. Moses, the fight on the Treaty would be a farce, because there is neither resourcefulness nor skill among its other opponents. Actually, the strategy of the whole opposition is in the tricky hands of the Honorable George. The bellowing will be done by the bellicose Johnson. There will be a long, dull, absurdly technical speech from "Freddie" Hale, loud explosions of eloquent alarm from the Farmer-Labor representative and others. But the moves will be directed entirely by Mr. Moses, operating as much as possible in the background and maintaining with the White House relations sufficiently diplomatic to avoid getting nailed.

George's game, of course, is delay. From his office emanate the round robins and other petitions asking the President not to call the special session. From him come the devious suggestions as to how the purpose of the session, if called, may be frustrated through the absence of a quorum, or by adjournment, or in other ways. He is steeped in mischief and consequently enjoying himself. And back of the whole business, of course, are the Hearst newspapers, whose real fight it is; without them there would be no substance at all to the Senate opposition. Despite the mischievous George and his numerous schemes for postponing action, the prevailing opinion still is that the Treaty will be ratified. For the Senate of the United States, four-fifths in favor of the Treaty, to resort to the sort of skullduggery suggested would be an exhibition so degrading as to divest that body of the remnant of respect it still retains and create a reaction favorable to the President—which of all things is least desired by a majority of its members. There is such a thing as being slick without being smart, a thought which the Honorable George, whom no one credits with a deep conviction in this matter, might profitably ponder.

Aside from the Treaty, political interest in Washington still is concentrated on the Morrow victory in New Jersey, the reverberations of which will be heard for a long time. Two things about the primary have so far escaped comment, although they are worthy of it. One is that Mr. Morrow's primary vote is sufficient to elect him in November, an astounding circumstance which makes it unnecessary for him to campaign and leaves him free to go to Mexico to tie up the loose ends of the really vital job he had to drop for the London conference. The other is that some well informed New Jersey men estimate that the unfortunate Frelinghuysen's vote of 45,000 cost him approximately $6 a vote. This fact—if it is a fact—will not be brought out by the Nye Committee or by anyone else. Further, these same men assert that, though the $46,000 alleged as the Morrow expenditure is perfectly all right as far as Mr. Morrow's knowledge is concerned, actually five times that amount was spent in his interest—another fact which will not be established, but which seems to me entirely plausible.

At any rate, these expenditures are moderate enough compared to those in Pennsylvania and Illinois, and they are, moreover, details. The big thing is that Mr. Morrow, to all intents and purposes, is now in the Senate, and through the spectacular nature of his triumph has become a real figure in the national political picture. There has been an epidemic of editorial comment upon the possibility of nominating him for the presidency in 1932, some of it in Republican papers such as The Detroit News, which heretofore have been strongly pro-Hoover. It is inspired largely by the general disappointment which resulted when the numerous optimistic White House predictions of business recovery failed to be borne out by the facts. The general political ineptitude of Mr. Hoover also plays its part. I do not take much stock in these Morrow-for-1932 forecasts. Men very close indeed to Mr. Morrow are convinced that when the time comes he will end this sort of talk by declaring himself in favor of the renomination of Mr. Hoover. He will not, they say, take it seriously unless he has to, but if that time comes he will deal with it in the way indicated.

I think this very likely. For one thing, Mr. Morrow is intelligent enough to know that the one year in the Senate which would precede the nominating convention would give him no chance to add appreciably to his reputation. It might very well happen that a condition of relative obscurity would be his lot in that year. For another thing, Mr. Morrow is sufficiently clear-headed to know the risk of rushing too fast. He knows that even if Mr. Hoover could be pushed aside in 1932, this kind of repudiation would be pretty apt to be fatal in the general election. He knows, too, that if prosperity returns, the talk of not renominating Herbert will be ridiculous, and that if prosperity does not return, the nomination would be worthless to him or any other. Finally, far from blaming Mr. Hoover for putting Mr. Fort into the field against him, as is alleged by many, he is quite convinced that Mr. Hoover had nothing whatever to do with it, and feels kindly toward him. Taking it all in all, the present effort to nominate Mr. Morrow for the presidency in 1932 does not seem to me to be much more than a flash in the pan. As for 1936, that is another matter entirely, but one too far off to speculate about.

The certainty that Mr. Morrow will be elected to the Senate in November slightly upsets the Democrats' calculation of the number of seats they will gain in that body, but they are adjusting the calculation now by substituting Illinois for New Jersey. And news from the Middle West apparently justifies the claim that the flamboyant Lewis's chances of beating the Widow McCormick are not far from even, notwithstanding the normal Republican majority. It is a fact that Mrs. McCormick's confidence of the result has seemed, these last few weeks, to be considerably diluted. She has a worried air and she talks a great deal about her troubles. She says she is going to have a "hard fight," that her opponent is full of guile and tricks, but that she will win. And probably she is right; but she is not so happy as she was, and is disposed to be

on the defensive and slightly plaintive. She did not like the Wet significance of the Morrow vote, and some of her Chicago friends have not added to her peace of mind by bringing rumors that the Crowe-Thompson machine, which rode with her against Deneen in the primaries, and was keen about putting Deneen out of the Senate, is not so keen about putting her in. Altogether, there is more than enough of this to depress an ordinary candidate. But the Widow McCormick is no ordinary candidate. She should buck up and be a man.

Washington. T. R. B.

# Admonition to the Pocahontases

I HAVE called them, from that first day I met them at someone's tea, where I had to go because it was to a failing, illustrious friend, the Pocahontases, because they, mother and son, are so Southern. They are genuinely Southern, naturally friendly, generous in praise, glad to see people, or, if not glad, all the more gracious, none too rich, cynically and swiftly intelligent, able to recognize mere commonness in however prominent a person, naturally zealous and, I am afraid, a little antagonistic, though this antagonism is sweetened with the desire for approval natural to most Southerners and is veiled with the friendliness they are apt to feel face to face even with people they hate—face to face with any decent person the Pocahontases feel kindly and affable, their innate springs of complaisance spout at almost any agreeable presence, though their charming cordiality may mean itself and little else.

They have grace of mind and common sense enough to have escaped being among the professional Southerners in New York, a race of beings whose ego is blown with the sheer difference they enjoy from the people around them, who live in New York and tire everybody with the fact that they came from somewhere else, farther toward the equator, and, if they lived nearer the equator, would rub in their former existence farther north—a melancholy tribe, in sum, whose distinction is latitudinal and whose standards are mere items of superior difference. That tedium the Pocahontases, thank heaven, have escaped. But still they surge, cut and swell, sometimes with a just aproposity, sometimes out of sheer vanity and irritation. I am setting up myself to become their adviser. I want them, along with thousands of others, to fight in order that, amidst the sweep of industrialism now spreading over the South, the characteristic Southern qualities may be preserved; but I also want them not to disgrace the thing they defend and not to be listed among such persons as proclaim these Southern qualities largely through irritation, hurt pride, long resentment and an inborn huffiness.

Not long ago a charming lady, with a whole forest of Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts family trees, was regretting, over the serenest of tea-cups, the disappearance in America of certain standards of conduct and life, the old sense of land and family, the old feeling about the family house and women, and so on and so on. And I heard Mrs. Pocahontas, all braced with good tea, speak up so far as to ask:

"Well, we had some of that in the South, of course, till such men as your uncle the general came down and destroyed it. Why, then, do you admire your uncle so much?"

That was not a perfect crash in such an apartment, it was almost rude, perhaps it was rude. I fancy Mrs. Pocahontas was thinking of that quiet great room, faded and unrepaired, where she grew up as a child, and then of the cramped and stale little apartment that she has on Park Avenue, a costly hovel fit only for people who come in sleepy and a little drunk and go out hurried and somewhat hypnotized with things to be done that morning. But even so, she should not have made the remark, especially with those spoons around that the general had accumulated at Savannah and that the hostess is no more responsible for than she is for the stain of the elderberry and soot shoeblacking that one of the boys in blue threw in the face of grandfather Pocahontas' portrait, and that has subsequently been scoured till it looks like some great birthmark that spreads even into his background.

All this is wrong in Mrs. Pocahontas. Let the dead past bury its dead. I have told her that and told her that the Southern habit, not unfamiliar to many, of highheadedness, scorn, pride, sentiment, bragging or spiteful reminiscence, is not the best way to help our cause, which at this day and time is the preservation in the new civilization of certain traditional and natural qualities that seem to us to be of great importance and to determine partly what the end of life is to be. The effect of such heady goings-on in some Southerners is for outsiders only puzzling or tedious, pathetic, quaintly endearing or what not, it is anything but useful in this new and pressing issue.

"We must not mistake," I say to the Pocahontases, "the bases of our beliefs. These preferences we aver are not based on reason, remember that; but they become perfect and consummate only by becoming rational. Put that in your pipe and smoke it."

But to work any good ends we shall have to find grounds for these qualities that we proclaim. You may hold as violent prejudices, preferences, opinions as you like. You are free about them, to endorse, to feel. But to press them on others you must find bases for them in conceptions, you must know. Otherwise the convincingness of what you say depends on your own charms. Otherwise you may be floored yourself with the ordinary jargon, clichés et cetera, coming in on us all from every direction.

Shall we take one trait, provincialism? It is a fine trait. It is analogous to one's interest in his own center, which is the most deeply rooted consideration he has, the source of his direction, health and soul. We can take New York as the great city, your town or country as its opposite. New York is provincial enough, Mrs. Pocahontas interrupts. Granted, but it is so large that the word suffers a certain paralysis of accusation. The petty faults and dark vices, the wear and tear, the belonging of everybody to everybody else, are such qualities as make the provinces oppressive to think about. But the time, the leisure, the openness of life, the echo in one's mind of things that come to it, of people, of music, of one's own quiet hours, are there also to consider. In New York there is the chance to be as protected, to live as privately as you like, or to circulate everywhere. There is the stream of life, the

wonder, the speed, change and magic, the size, the enterprise, a welling enchantment for those who either can feel it or read it into themselves out of the movies and magazines. There are museums of art, chances to rise to larger fortune, to meet larger brokers or more artists, to be a freer being, to play bridge with more prominent ladies and so on. You have too, as we are often told, in such a place the sense of the future, whatever innocent notion that may imply.

These points are, some of them, made by the Pocahontases, some by the son, who is a bright chap, graduated from the University of Virginia and then a post-graduate of Harvard. But such points only serve to show how we can miss the track and to illustrate what the nature of conceptions implies. This comparative display has little to do with provincialism; it concerns only where at the moment you choose to live. Provincialism is not a matter of the place you live in, but a state of mind. You can defend your provincialism to yourself very much as you would defend your own nature, which you would not change with anyone else. You may be at home over the whole world or you may never have been out of your county, and yet feel as provincial as ever at heart. You may be even more provincial sometimes after travel and its peculiar disparagements and confirmations of what is already in you. You may dislike living in the South and yet be strongly provincial about it. No matter where you may be, if there is some voice or way of speaking, or some song you heard often once, or some fragrance almost forgotten, or the moon rising suddenly under tall trees, and tears fill your eyes at the memory of other days in a certain country, that country is yours, and however wonderful the place around you is, or any place, it, more than any other, is beautiful in your heart, which narrows and deepens at the thought of it. People who give up easily their feeling about their country will bear careful watching. I am not sure that one of the deep mysteries, one of the great, as it were, natural beauties of the heart, does not lie in one's love of his native earth. If there is a sadness, or old memory, added to this sense, it may become part of the substance on which the soul makes its tragic journey.

I mean to try further hints on provincialism and see whether or not the Pocahontases will be troubled as to what conceptions they should come to of matters like aristocracy, pride, manners and so on, about which now, without having thought much about bases, they soar and prattle, nearly always entertainingly, I must admit, not often impolitely, but rarely wisely.

STARK YOUNG.

# *CORRESPONDENCE*

## Palestine—Whose Homeland?

SIR: In The New Republic of June 11, a correspondent who calls himself "Jerusalemite Arab" questions the right of the Jews to claim their national home in Palestine, saying that "the Jews were always a wandering race since Abraham," and that their "temporary sojourn in Palestine was a period of vassalage to the neighboring peoples."

This is absurd. The wandering of the Jews ended when, under the leadership of Joshua, they took possession of Palestine. Their settlement there was permanent, not temporary. With the exception of some short periodical interruptions and the fifty years of Babylonian captivity, the Jews held Palestine as a sovereign state from 1455 B. C. to 70 A. D. This millennium and a half of national independence "Jerusalemite Arab" calls cynically a "temporary sojourn in vassalage." He also states that "Palestine has remained the Arab home for the last 1,400 years." But not all this time as an independent nation! Their independence lasted only from 638 A. D. until 1453, when they were enslaved by the Turks. They remained Turkish subjects until the World War.

What have the Arabs achieved in the field of civilization during the 1,400 years of their "permanent sojourn in Palestine"? In 1912, when I visited that country, life there was as primitive, very likely, as the Jewish wanderer, Abraham, found it when he left Ur of the Chaldees. The country was in a deplorable state, disgraceful to civilization. When I visited the country a second time, in 1925, I found in the Jewish settlements modern improvements: electric lights, water works, sanitation, good roads, and, instead of the Arabian means of locomotion—the ass and the camel—automobiles were running in every direction. In the 100-percent Jewish city of Tel-Aviv there is even an opera house. The Jews have achieved in a decade in Palestine more than had the Arabs in all the 1,400 years of their sojourn there! And yet would "Jerusalemite Arab" have the backward nation which he represents block the immigration of a people able and willing to transform the chaos in Palestine into a living paradise!

H. BIRKNER.

Whitman, Mass.

## California Has a Relapse

SIR: After a trial lasting three weeks in the Superior Court of Imperial County, California, nine men have been convicted on three counts each of violation of the Criminal Syndicalism Law, and five have received terms in San Quentin of from three to forty-two years each. This is the first time in almost six years that the Criminal Syndicalism Law has been invoked in this state to curb the activities of so-called Reds. The real "crime" that these nine men committed was trying to organize the cantaloupe workers of the Imperial Valley into a Trade Union Unity League branch—an Agricultural Workers' Industrial League.

In January last, attempts were made to form a union among the lettuce workers of the Valley, but they failed due to the vigilance of the sheriff, Charles L. Gillette, and his deputies, who jailed the leaders on charges of vagrancy and disturbing the peace. This is the sheriff, by the way, who assaulted me when I called on him and intimated that the men he had grabbed and was holding in his jail had done nothing worthy of arrest. I brought charges of assault and battery against him in the justice's court and he was found guilty and fined $150. He has since appealed the case to the superior court.

Sheriff Gillette and the police of Brawley and El Centro have declared a moratorium on free speech and free assembly in the Valley. They stationed their men around the entrance of a hall where the International Labor Defense had advertised a meeting, a few nights ago, and would allow no one to enter the place.

Altogether, a most serious situation is again confronting us in California. This trial may be the signal for the revival of the Criminal Syndicalism Law in many places. We must resist with all our power the putting of these nine men into prison. That will cost a lot of money. Will you who have such matters as this at heart—who care for the preservation of our freedom—send us contributions to carry on the fight we are waging? Make the checks generous, please, and send them to the American Civil Liberties Union, Southern California Branch, 1022 California Building, Los Angeles, California.

CLINTON J. TAFT,
Director.

Los Angeles, Calif.

# Modern Culture

*A History of Modern Culture. Volume I: The Great Renewal: 1543-1687, by Preserved Smith. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 672 pages. $5.*

PROFESSOR Preserved Smith's study of the beginning of modern culture in the western world is one of the most able, seasoned pieces of history that has been produced in America during the last twenty years. Since this period includes the work of men like Beard and Morison and Becker and Haskins, his achievement ranks very high indeed. His details are as thick as raisins in a plum pudding: while over the whole work dances the transparent blue flame of a fine intelligence, adding its own flavor to the compact mass itself. On tasting it carefully, I find that the orange peel or the citron has been left out; but except for this lapse, the pudding is well mixed and skillfully blended.

The period which forms the subject of this first volume extends from 1543 to 1687. In science, the boundary marks are Copernicus and Newton; in literature, Spenser and Milton; in painting, El Greco and Rubens. It is an age when the earth and sky suddenly opened before man, and when, in the first tint of the dawn, a vast rabble of spirits and demons disappeared like a mist eaten up by the sun: when the black shapes that had haunted the medieval mind turned out to be the limbs of a tree, and the horrid noise that had moaned through the night proved, on examination, to be no more than the scraping of a twig against the windowpane.

The demons did not disappear without a gibber of protest; for this century saw that cruelest of religious wars in the Low Countries and Germany, to say nothing of the bloody persecution of witches; but, as the sun rose, the contours of the whole landscape altered: new lands heaved out of the ocean, and were accurately outlined by the cartographers; the study of the heavens was rounded out by a fresh, scientific interest in the forms and habits of natural creation; fish and mammals, accurately described, were distinguished from the griffons and dragons of folklore; the circulation of the blood was established; and mathematics replaced dialectics as the chief tool of abstract thought. In Machiavelli and Hobbes the attitude, if not the method, of an objective social science was foreshadowed; while in Shakespeare half the dilemmas of modern thought and feeling are depicted: in him, far more than in Rousseau, one can find the beginning of modern romanticism, with its glorification of the individual, its exaltation of the separate ego, its skepticism, its cult of nationality and its hints of spiritual disintegration and madness. Psychology, as a consciousness of the mind's processes, rather than of its rationalizations, comes to life in Shakespeare and Spinoza. In short, modern times begin!

This period is worth studying carefully, not merely because of its lush personalities, its fascinating episodes, its memorable contributions to experience; but also because it contains so much of our own age in the germ. Professor Smith puts at our disposal almost all the material necessary to verify or correct such tactful generalizations as he now and then makes: unlike the witty but erratic Egon Friedell, whose history of modern culture has lately been translated, he does not make one feel that the brilliance of his interpretation is in inverse proportion to the number of facts at his disposal. His is not a huge Baroque façade, concealing a small structure of details: it is rather a solid American factory building, equally sound in each part, and atoning for its slightly monotonous fenestration by the flood of light the windows let in.

In attempting a rounded treatment of the period, Professor Smith has covered philosophy, education, literature, manners, morals and art; but he has treated certain parts with preëminent skill. The section on science, for example, forms almost a quarter of the book, and I know of no one who has handled the subject better in such brief compass. His emphasis is, moreover, entirely justified, for science, with all the habits and interests it implied, was the decisive new factor in the life of the European: it was the "emergent element" which marked the age of the Great Renewal, and there was not a phase of life that was untouched by it. Nor does Professor Smith make the mistake of limiting science to mechanics and astronomy: he shows us the beginning of geography, botany, physiology, chemistry. Many men of science would agree, I believe, that he overrates the importance of Bacon, who contributed nothing to scientific thought except the fallacy that it is based primarily upon the art of induction—a notion that would throw out the two great pillars of modern science, mathematics and the choice of logical categories and hypotheses—but such an acceptance of traditional evaluation is a minor lapse; and Professor Smith can doubtless range on his own side many serious scholars.

With a work that is carried through, in many departments, with consummate skill and rigor and with such a good sense of values as this study of the Great Renewal, one hesitates to point out the weak places and omissions, lest such notice imply too great a diminution of the real excellences; but there are one or two matters that call for attention. The first is that Professor Smith, not unaffected perhaps by James Harvey Robinson's classic course, takes the history of culture to be "in a sense, the history of the intellectual class." This is a damnable error: it leads to a neglect, not only of the roots of culture, but of the conditions of soil, atmosphere and microscopic organism, all so important to it; and it puts an excessive premium upon that part of culture which has achieved literary expression, or at least codification. Thus, in discussing the literature of this period, Professor Smith says nothing about its popular manifestations, the ballad, the snatch, the carol, the work-song; and he treats the theater without reference to the transition from the mystery and the morality. Yet how can we understand the utilitarian abstraction of work from play, consummated in the power-driven machine and the highly organized factory, without reference to the collective work-rhythm which, as Karl Buecher pointed out, set the pace of handicraft production and united work and play in an integral form; and how can we realize the devastating practice of giving all the play to one class and all the work to another? The fact that Snout and Starveling originally enacted the play, instead of witnessing a caricature of themselves in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," tells a very significant story about the Great Renewal—a significance which is lost, however, if one's eyes are glued to the intellectual classes. The dance is forgotten, except as it concerned a contemporary moralist, and this account of the age of the Elizabethan songbook and domestic part-singing, to say nothing of the Puritan psalm, has not a single reference to music.

During this period the largely organic planning of the medieval city was supplanted by a new type which emphasized the avenue, the parallel relationship of façades and a formal geometrical layout; but Professor Smith makes no reference to the profound alterations in city planning that took place, nor yet to the heightened formalism of landscapes and gardens, while his chapter on Baroque art is a

short one and the references to architecture itself are scant and superficial. Sport and war, considered as arts, are likewise neglected: yet one might as well try to understand Phidias without taking in the *palaestra* as to understand Hals and Rubens, let us say, without reference to the kermess. As for the gun, it was almost as important as the telescope in altering our conceptions of space; and the new instruments of warfare had a profound effect upon another art which, for some obscure reason, Professor Smith passes by, namely, the art of engineering, so closely allied to all the dominant forces of the time, including that completer recovery of classic learning which restored the knowledge of Hero's steam engine. If the character of a technology and the part it plays in social life does not belong to the history of culture, the reason does not lie in the facts of culture, but in the preoccupation of the intellectual classes.

So, while Professor Smith has achieved a great part of his aim, to "exhibit as a unified whole the state and progress of modern culture," and while he has admirably avoided the vices of a national parochialism and exhibited the common tradition of our civilization, he has left certain valuable aspects out of the picture. I would not willingly forfeit a single chapter Professor Smith has written; but I would have him add to it material from sources he has not chosen to draw upon; for culture has to do with the creation of forms and symbols and significances; and wherever these processes are going on, culture has its habitat. It belongs to the kitchen as well as the palace: clothes and cooking exhibit it as well as philosophy and poetry; it arises out of the work of the miner, the shepherd, the herbalist, quite as much as out of a Newton, a Jeremy Taylor, a Vesalius. Some of this material in past times is buried beyond recall, as the Cornish language died on the lips of the last Cornish crone who remembered it; but other parts of it exist in landscapes and cities and monuments and living traditions; and they must not be forgotten. One looks forward to the subsequent volumes of this history with eagerness. May one hope that Professor Smith will see fit to redeem one or two of the neglected provinces of culture? They would benefit by his rule.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

# Emily Dickinson Again

*The Life and Mind of Emily Dickinson, by Genevieve Taggard. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 384 pages. $4.*

*Emily Dickinson, Friend and Neighbor, by MacGregor Jenkins. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 150 pages. $3.*

THERE have been various attempts to solve the mystery of Emily Dickinson: that queer New England spinster whose life was a perpetual attendance in the kitchen, in the sick-room, in her garden enclosed, yet who made of her few and seemingly stuffy years, profound, consummate poetry. Miss Taggard's study is, however, the first work on the subject to be done by a person so well equipped for the task. It is fitting that Emily Dickinson's biographer should be a poet. And it is all to the good that she should not be too much overawed either by the Dickinson tradition or by current psychological dogmas; that, furthermore, without at all paralleling Emily's experience, she should have sufficient points of contact with it to understand its crisis.

Miss Taggard's book is not perfect. Let us dismiss its defects at once, that we may enlarge upon its excellences. She states in her foreword that "the book is woven of two strands, Emily's outer and her inner existence, the outer becoming less significant, and the inner more so, and often very contradictory, as the story progresses. In telling this story, I have to follow Emily's presentiments and repetitions." It seems to the reviewer that the biographer could have been faithful to Emily's vacillations, paradoxes, reiterations, and yet have managed a more integrated account of them. There is a touch of vulgarity, perhaps inevitable under the circumstances, in the documentary evidence as to the facts of Emily's personal history, more particularly since these sworn statements about her love affair are signed by "Z" and "Y." Occasionally, Miss Taggard fails to work over her raw material, as in her list of Emily's "legal words," several of which are not part of a lawyer's vocabulary exclusively.

The book as a whole has many virtues. It presents Emily about as distinctly as anything could outside of her own poetry, which is quoted too little, partly because of jealous restrictions of copyright. One sees the gay, plain, brilliant girl, dominated by the father who drew the blueprint by which her outer life was erected, early inducted into the study of immortality by Tutor Humphrey, who died young, but not before he had told her she would become a poet; learning more of life by renouncing first her lover George Gould, and later, the world beyond her doorstep, than most people do by living it; shaken out of her dutiful silence by the Civil War; becoming a recluse "partly to escape her father, and partly to obey him, since obey she must. . . ." One sees her small and timid against the looming familial background, great and indomitable, not beyond a saving chuckle, in her communion with life, death and God. The home, the austere dominating presence of the father, the little trivial mother Vinnie, to a lesser degree Austin, are clearly indicated. Sister Sue is too slightingly dismissed: one is sensible of literary grudges here. Amherst is set down, and its outstanding personalities. So, too, poor dear Major Higginson, who stood to Emily for a brief time as father and God, and failed so naturally; as well as other figures, larger and lesser, whose lives were tangent to Emily's. One would have liked a bit more of Maggie, the ruling domestic, of Major Hunt, recently described as Emily's lover (Miss Taggard punctures this theory). One wants much more of George Gould, the true beloved, who failed almost as badly as Major Higginson. But one is abidingly grateful that Miss Taggard, in treating Emily, has escaped the idolatry of Mme. Bianchi on the one hand, and the gentle reverence of Mr. Jenkins on the other.

In his account of the poet as "friend and neighbor," Mr. Jenkins, once one of the little lads to whom she made gifts of flowers, cookies and poetry, has written a book which gives one "Miss Emily" from the angle of one who has often seen her misjudged and who, remembering the magic she exercised over his boyhood, wishes to restore her to as much respectability as a witch of a poet may possess. His slight and tender volume professes no more than it performs. Somehow it leaves one with a deep sense of Emily's necessity for secluding herself from friends and neighbors if she was to be a poet—as she must. Miss Taggard's volume does not quite take sufficient account of this aspect of Emily's situation: father is so big that the rest of the town looks little.

But if she fails to accent certain details, the main outline is there—the emphasis on Emily's private drama, the triangle of Father, Self and God—the emphasis on what she calls "the anonymous mind." Her book, which is prefaced by a sensitive poem to her subject, and has a delicate

quatrain for its epigraph, might well have carried also an inscription from Yeats's "Autobiographies": "It is only when the intellect has wrought the whole of life to drama, to crisis, that we may live for contemplation, and yet keep our intensity." BABETTE DEUTSCH.

# Two Books on Satan

*The Devil: An Historical, Critical and Medical Study, by Maurice Garçon and Jean Vinchon. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 288 pages. $3.50.*

*The Life of the Devil, by Louis Coulange. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 304 pages. $5.*

THESE two books on the Father of Lies come to the present reviewer as inopportunely as they appear against the setting of the present century. Outside my window, the peaceful little river Loing flows cheerfully, skimmed by swallows and butterflies, framed in a garland of rushes and briar-roses, while beyond rises one of the most arresting Gothic profiles of rampart and belfry to be found in France, all testifying pleasantly to the continued existence of a kindly Nature environing a Christian State. Would it were so, or had ever been so. It was precisely in the century which saw the partial erection of Our Lady of Moret across the stream that the Inquisitor Boguet, in the neighboring province of Burgundy, burned some nine hundred poor wretches who confessed, after refined tortures, to have had professional doings with the Lord of Evil. There are still cases of witchcraft and sorcery which come up regularly before French tribunals, and the same phenomenon is not unknown by report in the land of the Ford. Such reflections, however inevitable after perusing the two erudite tomes in question, do not exactly increase one's gaiety, nor one's blind confidence in the general intelligence of human beings.

Of the two books, that of MM. Garçon and Vinchon, who are well known French psychiatrists, is by far the more sympathetic. The other by an alleged priest, though it abounds in nasty erudition, in long quotations from all the more dismal of ancient Church Fathers, assumes throughout a tone of elaborate irony which, were it at all touched by genius, would be almost Voltairian. "A singular clergyman," as somebody says in Dickens. The two men of science, on the other hand, explain lucidly and with respect for orthodox tradition the origin of the Demon, his unfortunate transformation in the minds of the faithful throughout the centuries and his present status and occupation. His origin, quite apart from the personal symbolism employed for him in the Scriptures, and even in the mouth of Jesus, lay simply in the need men have of externalizing their own feelings of impotence and frustration. "Thou art not the author of thy sin," says St. Cyril reassuringly to his catechumens, "there is another who bears thee towards it." "The evil that I would not," remarked St. Paul with melancholy, "that I do."

How was this perversity to be accounted for? Surely by the existence of an invisible force, a spiritual principle of ill doing, hostile to God, and without whose darkness the divine Goodness would not be refulgent. The best Christian ethics have always had this mildly Manichean element, it being rightly judged revolting to decent minds that God should be considered as really all-powerful, and not Himself at war against the Evil that is the world. It is perhaps not very clear, but it has all been explained poetically and no doubt lucidly by Mr. H. G. Wells, who has occupied himself with the problem. It is clear, at all events, that the Church originally regarded Satan as a purely moral principle, none the less real, because, like God Himself, of spiritual essence, and this rational view continued among theologians as late as 1310, when the Council of Trèves persisted in regarding Witches' Sabbaths and similar disgusting phenomena cherished by the popular imagination, as mere "illusions" of the Demon, and their participants as mentally diseased. Nobody imagined at that time, as Miss Murray does today, that popular Satanism might be a fertility cult, for the simple reason that one of the favorite diversions of the warlocks was to destroy crops by producing late springs and prolonged frosts. Eventually, and during the full Renaissance, the Church ceded to the popular demand for sinister marvels, for a Satan all tail and horns, and brought down on the heads of the witches themselves the long, dreadful and utterly superstitious persecution which was continued beyond its allotted span by our Calvinist friends the Puritans, in free America.

At present, if people are no longer "possessed" in a Scriptural or medieval sense, we have yet to hear that asylums and nursing homes have been stripped of their inmates. On the contrary they seem full to bursting in what Mr. Harold Stearns once called the land of neuroses. Certain forms of the latter look uncommonly like the phenomenon which our fathers quite rationally called "possession," and in the last paragraph of their instructive book, MM. Garçon and Vinchon call for a new collaboration of priest and physician in cases where veritably the modern "Demon" is involved.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT.

# Tall Tales and Torrid Trails

*Tall Tales of the Southwest, edited by Franklin J. Meine. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 178 pages. $3.50.*

*A Vaquero of the Brush Country, by J. Frank Dobie. Dallas, Texas: The Southwest Press. 314 pages. $3.50.*

*Death Valley, by Bourke Lee. New York: The Macmillan Company. 210 pages. $3.50.*

*The Last Rustler, by Lee Sage. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 303 pages. $3.*

MR. F. J. TURNER'S famous thesis on the significance of the frontier in American history, first stated in 1893, did not really gain popular acceptance until the frontier had become distant enough to be enchanting. It was republished in a volume of essays in 1920; four years later Paxson's first definitive history of the frontier followed. From 1925 to 1927 there was a general outpouring: three inclusive pieces of literary interpretation, six collections of songs and ballads and eight or ten volumes of description and reminiscence. Magazine articles on the cowboy cited in the cumulative index, rose from an average of two a year from 1919 to 1921 to an average of nine from 1925 to 1927, and articles and stories of frontier life from three a year in the earlier period to twenty-four a year in the latter. The four volumes at hand testify that the interest in the old Southwest has not yet waned.

Mr. Meine's collection of frontier stories—not all tall tales, nor all from the Southwest—is a thorough piece of editing by an enthusiast in this field. He is quite right in stating in his introduction that they are drawn from a treasury of information on the social life of the region, and in asserting that students of history and literature have been equally indifferent to them. He does not seem to be so near to the truth when he calls them entertaining and

delightful. As humor they bore me. The flatness of many and the crassness of many more make me understand the flatness and crassness of Mark Twain at his worst; but they are valuable documents in both social and literary history, and as a student I value them as I do a good bibliography or a well compiled chronological chart.

The two books on the cow country, "The Last Rustler" and "A Vaquero of the Brush Country," are both drawn from personal experience. Harvey Fergusson found Lee Sage conducting a riding school in Salt Lake City, listened to many of his yarns and persuaded him to dictate them. The resultant book he offers, with some slight pruning and correcting, as a product of the Western tradition of camp-fire story-telling. The material of the loosely connected series of recollections is convincing, the idiom is often unique to the plains, and the character of the story-teller true to type in its combination of bold-badness and youthful sentimentalism. The book is not in any technical sense folk literature, as the editor calls it, but it is doubtless an authentic record of oral story-telling and deserves attention as such.

"A Vaquero of the Brush Country" is a nice piece of collaboration. J. Frank Dobie, whose name is on the title page, was born and reared in the brush country and later managed a large ranch there He has supplemented his memories by a good deal of careful study. From these sources he has supplied the background for the reminiscences of John Young, which form the main thread of the book. In the broad it gives a clear picture of life in the cattle country in the transition from the first era of the open range and free grass to the second of barbed wire enclosures and thirst, these to be followed by the present period of secure fencing and adequate watering.

And "The Vaquero" is lively history in the vividness with which it presents the followers of the old cattle trails. Lee Sage says, "I believe the spirit of man builds the spirit of the country he lives in," and proceeds to a passage that proves the exact opposite. John Young, through his interpreter, shows how time and place transform men into agents of destiny. "Hearing old-timers prate about their 'sacrifices' and trying to make martyrs out of themselves has always disgusted me. . . . We were all pretty much creatures of circumstance. That circumstance sometimes brought out in us endurance and fidelity almost heroic . . . but if we had not grown up with the soil between our toes, the wind in our faces, the starlight in our eyes, and a peculiar and strict code of ethics in our consciousness, we might not have been able to meet the tests that were applied." Dobie and Young between them give an extraordinarily real sense of how men lived and fought and rode, of how resourceful and how expert they had to be in pursuing the complicated business of cattle raising and cattle trading. And the joint result is very well written.

"Death Valley," a book of the westernmost frontier, almost as forbidding in format as in title, is an extremely good piece of writing. Says the title page, "This story of Death Valley includes the geologic history of the Valley and a survey of its plants and animal life, but the bulk of the book is about men—Indians, emigrants and miners—who have known the Death Valley trails." The book even includes that most ominous of features for the casual reader, a bibliography. But Bourke Lee makes the technical parts interesting and the human chapters, especially "Lost Emigrants" and "Mines and Miners," as memorable as their sunburnt, windswept settings.

The whole frontier resurgence into popular attention has been quite true to literary history. The frontier has been content to be itself, sing its songs, spin its yarns. It has never yearned to put itself accurately on paper. The desire for realism about it has always been the desire of the remote observer. Now, however, all observers are remote at least at times, and most of us in mileage as well. While the memories recede and the characteristics fade, the present is collecting them just as it collects ships' clocks and Windsor chairs. These four volumes are eligible for such a collection.

PERCY H. BOYNTON.

# Strindberg

*August Strindberg, the Bedeviled Viking, by V. J. McGill. New York: Brentano's. 459 pages. $4.*

GEORG BRANDES introduced Strindberg to Nietzsche as "a bit mad but a true genius." Dr. McGill has made him also a tragic figure.

In the midst of the European disorder of 1849, Strindberg was born in a poverty-stricken flat in Stockholm of an aristocratic father and a servant mother. Naturally bright, he was held back by a school system attuned to mediocrity. While he was still young, his mother died and his father remarried. The unsatisfied love for his mother turned into an intense hatred for his step-mother. From eighten to twenty-three, he attended the university of Upsala, where his poverty and his contempt for the system of instruction interrupted his studies. He tried his hand at tutoring, teaching telegraphy, journalism, medicine, and finally at acting. During this period he wrote two plays which won him a royal stipend at Upsala, but he lost it through his failure to pass the examinations and his continued attacks on the university. He returned to Stockholm and embarked on the precarious but fascinating career of literature. In the fall of 1874 he was appointed secretary in the Royal Library, and for researches there in the Chinese language he was honored, years later, by the French Academy. At this time he met Siri von Essen, wife of Baron Wrangel, captain of the Guards. A strange intimacy grew up among the three. Siri took on, for him, the image of his mother. In time Siri and the captain were divorced, and she and Strindberg married. There followed a short period of happiness.

In 1879 appeared his novel "The Red Room," which won tremendous popular and critical praise. This unsentimental portrayal of the bohemian life of artists and students marked the birth of Swedish Naturalism, of which Strindberg was the father.

But his marriage had become a continual struggle and disillusionment. The madonna became the wife with Lesbian and promiscuous inclinations, while Strindberg's mother-worship drove him into extreme fits of jealousy and exaggerated demands for perfection. His divorce in 1891 left him lonely and dispirited. He soon contracted a second marriage, which proved, however, of short duration.

His intense jealousy and persecution complex had brought on a mental crisis in 1886-7, and after his second divorce there came another crisis. He went to Paris, where, in a state of complete mental derangement, he began to make grandiose chemical experiments.

Under a doctor's care at Lund, he was brought back from the borderland of insanity through the reawakening of his literary powers and gradual religious conversion. There he fell in love with a young Norwegian actress and married for the third time; but this marriage, like the second, lasted but a short time.

At last, in 1911, the man who had all his life been hated by the people for reviling their most sacred institutions suddenly began to weaken physically and a few months later the wild madman of the north was silent forever.

Dr. McGill has pictured an erratic genius who startled Europe with his vituperations and who was yet tragic because he was his own undoing. We are told that his works, always autobiographical, form a striking study of the Œdipus complex. Born into a home already overcrowded, he failed to get that love and care which might have helped him to make an adequate adjustment to life. Contending that women could not expect to be bread-winners any more than men could expect to be child-bearers, he violently attacked the feminist movements, and this gave rise to the still popular misconception that he was a misogynist. He found doors closed, honors refused, and the epithet of madman flung at him till he doubted his own sanity.

It was as a dramatist that Strindberg made his most original contribution to literature. But his plays have been unsuccessful in this country, due, probably, to a lack of understanding not only of the man, but of the whole Scandinavian psychology. Dr. McGill has tried to remedy this deficiency, and to that extent his book is valuable. But his too frequent retelling of Strindberg's plots encumbers the biography.

Also, one of the most important facts about Strindberg is that he fathered a new type of literature, and we should expect his biographer to explain why, at a time when Sweden was steeped in the idealistic writings of Victor Rydberg and the classic poetry of Carl Snoilsky, Strindberg should have turned to the stark naturalism of "The Red Room." Dr. McGill does not, however, give any adequate explanation of this phenomenon.

ELSA M. ALLEN.

# A Bravery of Earth

*A Bravery of Earth, by Richard Eberhart. New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. 128 pages. $2.*

FIRST ventures into verse are apt to take the form of thin volumes of fragile lyrics, derivative and carefully whittled. One is somewhat startled, therefore, by the audacity of Richard Eberhart, whose long poem, "A Bravery of Earth," is a kind of spiritual autobiography, a chronicle not wholly personal of the progressive states of being through which maturity is achieved. To quote one of Mr. Eberhart's happier phrases, it is a song "from the shocked throat of youth." It records youth's first fierce joy in the mere magic of living, before the "ache of the mind" destroys delighted awareness of sensuous beauty. Then follows disillusionment, perception of the chaos and cruelty of the world. The poet seeks assuagement "on the wilderness hill of art" and then through probing of the mind's own element. Chilled and driven back to earth and men, he finally comes by deep contact with reality to understand mankind's desire and destiny:

> Youth lies buried and man stands up
> In a bravery of earth.

In many ways this poem is groping, immature and confused. There are long abstract passages in which the concrete quickening image is lacking. There are frequent roughnesses of rhythm which seem quite wanton, considering the pure music of some of the lyric interludes. Nevertheless, Mr. Eberhart is master of a priceless secret. He touches ecstasy more closely and more often than do most of the poets of this century. There is a fresh, rapt quality of emotion in the earlier half of the poem which reminds one of the singing passages in Wordsworth's "Prelude" and particularly of those lines, "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive." In the last section, moreover—an account of his trip to the Orient on a tramp freighter—there is an unleashed vigor, a crude power, which needs only discipline to direct it into unusually fruitful channels. Confessedly, Mr. Eberhart has buried his adolescence. From now on his work should be worth watching.

EDITH H. WALTON.

# Notes on Novels

*Down In Flames, by Ben Ray Redman. New York: Brewer and Warren. $2.*

HERE ARE nine or ten short stories, each having more or less to do with flying. The element of tragedy is present in all of them, but a curious note of humor is struck at times. In one, a man about to go to London on three days' leave plays poker the night before, hoping to win enough money to give himself a good time. At one o'clock he is twenty pounds ahead; the game is about to break up, but a friend who doesn't feel like going to bed persuades him to play some more. He loses every penny, and early the next morning his friend, stunting in his airship, accidentally kills himself "Imagine it," says the indignant narrator. "That little S. O. B. had gone and killed himself with my twenty quid in his pocket. He hadn't spent a single bob of it, not a single bob. Did you ever hear of a trick like that in your life? . . . And I sat on the Court of Inquiry and sent that twenty quid back to his father, who is stinking rich. Think of that!" In another, we follow the thoughts of a man who has miraculously escaped death from two enemy planes. One of his most persistent ideas is that the next time he is in Paris he will go to the hotel bathroom where he saw the sign "*On est prié de ne pas monter sur le siège avec les pieds*" and mount straight upon the seat with his feet. He never does, though; he runs out of petrol in the mist and crashes. Mr. Redman writes well, with both wit and feeling. These stories have a very distinct literary flavor and are obviously the work of one who is at home in the world of aviation.

G. T. H.

*The Way Home, by Henry Handel Richardson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. $2.50.*

THIS VOLUME, which completes for us H. H. Richardson's Australian trilogy, serves also to reaffirm her solid literary powers. Any comparisons that might be made concerning "The Way Home" and its predecessors would be irrelevant, for the three books are, to an unprecedented degree, identical in materials, treatment and tragic portent. The figure of Richard Mahony wears throughout its particular aura of impending psychic disintegration; regarded from any point in its course, the history of his fortunes presents the aspect of a stream heading down inevitable channels towards a fated sea. In this mediate volume, with Mahony at the highest point of his ascendancy, we are oppressed by the certain premonition of what is to come in "Ultima Thule," just as, in "Australia Felix," we saw written large the prophecy of his defeat. It is this consummate unity which enabled the trilogy to survive the illogical order of its appearance.

The degree to which H. H. Richardson has succeeded in her portrait is an indication of the great restraint which made it possible. She wields with ease a prose that is self-effacing in its objectivity. Save in such rare, heightened instances as the death of John Turnham, her writing never rises out of its appointed function as a means of simple communication. It is the unselfish prose of the historian. Yet the irreproachable choice of detail, the perfect rounding of each minor character, the close scrutiny of causes and effects, betray the presence of a first-rate intellect. We await the American republication of "Maurice Guest."

N. L. R.

*The Days of Her Life, by Wallace Irwin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.50.*

IF WALLACE IRWIN had titled his novel "Old San Francisco," it would have been more to the purpose. As far as human drama is concerned, the book falls woefully short. Who cares, after all, about the beautiful Emma—she who elopes from a mining settlement with a gambler only to find him a bigamist, who marries a rich and crippled dealer in oriental antiques, who refuses to desert her saint-like invalid when romance belatedly comes strolling by. The much-married Emma and her oddly assorted parcel of lovers are unconvincing creatures. One suspects that even Mr. Irwin was less interested in them than in his nostalgic memories of the mining towns of Colorado, and of San Francisco in the '80's and '90's—that city of violent, exciting contrasts, on whose precipitous streets Chinamen jostled elbows with spoiled young bloods, with hoboes and literary men and new-made millionaires. As a panoramic glimpse of the past, the book is excellent—full of color and stir. One can afford to overlook its defects as a novel of character.

E. H. W.

*On Virgin Soil, a Novel of Exotic Africa, by Balder Olden. Translated from the German by Lorna Dietz. New York: The Macaulay Company. $2.50.*

THIS NOVEL shows how the war was waged in German East Africa. Lieutenant Huessen, for all his trig, military correctitude, is at heart a sentimentalist of the old German school. He is young and still somewhat of an idealist. The people who share his life include drunks, dreamers, derelicts, misfits and savages. Mr. Olden's object seems to be to exploit the setting rather than the action. With crude vividness he pictures the "mush, meat and women" which are the *summum bonum* of the Negro warrior tribes. We are presented with the familiar spectacle of white men and women discarding civilized restraints in the tropics. With lush, wholesale strokes, Mr. Olden paints the brilliant scenery. At times he becomes ecstatic. The end is tragic. Huessen goes insane and all the other characters are either killed or ruined. For those who want a picture of the last days of German East Africa, this novel has its interest.

*The Crime of the Just, by Andre Chamson. Translated from the French by Van Wyck Brooks. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.*

FOR GENERATIONS the Arnal family had been the lawgivers and the moral rulers of a certain commune in the stony Cévennes Mountains in southeastern France. On their large rambling farm at the head of the valley, the brothers, sisters, parents, grandparents and cousins of this family lived, doing their own work and hiring no outside help. Once a week the Councilor, the head of the clan, came to the village to settle the disputes of neighbors. He was a patriarch whose decisions were sought by all, loved by all and respected by all. His opinions "were as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given by one shepherd." One winter, when the Arnals were isolated from the rest of the community, a deaf and dumb daughter of the family gave birth to a son, incestuously begotten. Family pride caused the murder of the child and the banishment of the girl's brother. In spite of a terrible bond of secrecy, the Arnal clan disintegrated in numbers, the infanticide was eventually disclosed and the Councilor arrested. The power and simplicity with which this tragedy is linked to its native background is reminiscent of "Ethan Frome." Perhaps it has not the poignancy and compactness of the latter work, but it is only by comparing it with Mrs. Wharton's great story that an idea of its true worth can be conveyed.

*The Man with the X-Ray Eyes and Other Stories from the Front, by Frois Froisland. Translated from the Norwegian by Nils Flaten. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.*

THESE stories are typical of the old-fashioned journalism. They are well spun yarns gathered by the author from his experiences as correspondent on the Allied fronts. They have conventional beginnings, turning points and ends. About two-thirds of the way through, the author usually stops and says, "What remains is little and can be told in a few words"; whereupon he proceeds to take his time and produce a fully upholstered tailpiece. But in spite of their rather stereotyped mechanics, these tales are worth while. The title story concerns Corporal MacMurray of Cincinnati, who was buried up to his armpits for two days during the first main attack on Saint-Mihiel by American troops. As a result of his wounds and hardships, MacMurray acquired a supernatural second sight. At first, he found that he could see through doors, boxes and people's clothing. Later he acquired the gift of augury. Of course his greatest feat was to foretell the day and hour of the Armistice accurately. "The Eagle's Nest" is perhaps the most original of the stories in regard to setting. It tells of life in a military post in the Italian Alps, a post which could only be reached by a cable-car across a dizzy ravine. It is a painstaking account which gives an unforgettable picture.

C. A. C.

## Contributors

WILLIAM ORTON is a professor of Economics and Sociology at Smith College, and author of a history of the modern British labor movement, "Labor in Transition."

SAVEL ZIMAND is the author of "Living India," "Modern Social Movements" and other books.

HELEN HALL was chairman of the unemployment study recently undertaken by the National Federation of Settlements.

BABETTE DEUTSCH, poet, novelist and critic, is the author of "Fire for the Night," "Potable Gold—Some Notes on Poetry" and other books.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT is the author of "Story of the Catholic Church." He is now living in France.

PERCY H. BOYNTON, professor of English at the University of Chicago, is the author of "Some Contemporary Americans" and "More Contemporary Americans."

ELSA M. ALLEN is a graduate of Brookwood Labor College and contributes articles to various magazines.

EDITH H. WALTON is on the staff of The Forum.

## SUMMER PLACES

**Aberdeen Inn.** West Park-on-Hudson. Overnight or permanent guests. Colonial house, thirty-six acres river front. Lawns, woods, beach. Center Catskill and Berkshire motoring. Accessible West Shore, N. Y. Central, via Poughkeepsie. Day line. For people who want quiet vacation in beautiful place. Rates moderate. Write **Manager, Aberdeen, West Park, New York.**

Quiet, charming vacation place for limited number of grown ups with artistic and literary interests. Modest rates. Ask for circular.

**CAMP ARTEMIS**
**BREWSTER NEW YORK**

**NEW HOPE,** Pennsylvania, rooms and meals, available from July 1st, in small seventeenth century stone house beautifully restored, near Delaware river, two miles north of New Hope. Write: Louise Holmquist.

**SPEND** delightful summer in Virginia. Off tourist route. Large colonial estate in Shenandoah Valley. Privacy. Best of Southern cooking. Seven hours to City. Free golf, $10 to $16 weekly. Major Marshall MacDonald, Media Farm, CHARLES TOWN, W. Va.

**FOR A RESTFUL WEEK END** or vacation in the beautiful Watchung Hills, fine views, bracing air, homelike atmosphere, finest foods. Individual diet if desired. 45 minutes from N. Y. C. R. R. of N. J. Mrs. Zerkover, R. F. D. 8, Plainfield, N. J. Phone Plainfield 6-5310 J-2.

For Relaxation, Beautiful Country, Pleasant Companionship, Tennis. Adults. Rates, $25.00 a Week.

Phone to

**The Hil-BERT HOUSE**
Lake Mahopac, New York

**HIL FRIEDBERG, Prop.** Tel. Mahopac 353.

**For your vacation,** furnished cottage, exclusive neighborhood, delightfully located. Swimming and tennis. $60 for two weeks, or $100 per month. Sign up now by writing Rose Angell, 113 Graham St., New Brunswick, N. J.

Country board in Maine. Women only. Lake, pine woods, cabins, all sports. $25 weekly. Address: Box 505, The New Republic.

## CHILDREN'S CAMP

**CAMP CEDAROAK**
**SHARON, CONN.**
affiliated with
*HOFFMANN* SCHOOL
**For Individual Development**
**JUNE-SEPTEMBER** **BOYS & GIRLS**
Tel. Kingsbridge 7361 **AGES, 5-12**

**CAMP ALADDIN**

**Parents** engaged in art and professions can place their young children in a charming environment and assure them the companionship of people who stress educational ideals rather than a profit making scheme. $200.00 for the summer. Write to **ROOK McCULLOCH,** Director, **BLACK HALL, CONNECTICUT.**

## HOME FOR CHILD

**Free home** offered to child 2 to 5 of good parentage. Christian. R. F. D. Box 96, Sharon, Mass.

## PARTNER WANTED

**MIDDLE AGED SINGLE MAN** wants agreeable partner with $5,000—secured by mortgage on New Jersey poultry plant in town of 10,000 population. No poultry work required. Living Supplied. **Address: Box 497, The New Republic.**

## FOR SALE OR RENT

**Summer rental or sale near Peekskill and Lake.** Good commuting. All year round estate—24 acres. Fine early American Farmhouse, excellent condition; 3 fireplaces, 11 rooms, 2 baths, delightful attic of 6 rooms; situated on a knoll surrounded by sloping lawns—beautiful old trees, shrubberies, fruit trees, vegetable garden, gardener's cottage, barns, chicken houses, cow and horse stalls, garage. Beautiful surrounding country—must be seen to be appreciated. Can also be used to advantage as a high class inn, worth $45,000. Offered for quick sale, no agents, at $30,000. Summer rental, $900. Address: Box 501, The New Republic.

## FOR SALE

**HOUSE IN CHELSEA**

$3,000 buys house facing park in old Chelsea. 4 stories, 12 rooms, 3 baths, steam heat, fireplaces, garden. Quick sale imperative. Price, $32,000. Bailey, 109 Seventh Avenue, South, New York City.

## SUMMER COTTAGES FOR RENT

**Old New England home** in Dorset, Vermont—10 airy, large rooms, 2 baths, electricity. One mile to field and golf club. Beautiful location on West Road. Reasonable Rent. Inquire: M. F. Gilbert, Dorset, Vermont. Phone 198-14.

**Furnished Rural Cottage** in New Jersey—40 minutes from Grand Central. Rent free to Gentile couple for services. Address: Box 506, The New Republic.

**KENNEBUNK BEACH, MAINE**

Furnished modern cottage, six minutes from beach; near Webbannet Golf Links, 8 rooms, garage, screened piazza. For season or by month. Miss Marion W. Perkins, Kennebunk Beach, Maine.

## FOR RENT

Will rent attractive home of 9 rooms (or part of it) for 3 months—July, August and September—to responsible party. Centrally located. Address: Evans, 535 Craig Ave., Staten Island, N. Y.

**Greenwich Village:** Charming 3-room apartments, artistic and different. Roof garden overlooking Hudson River. Very convenient to 9th Avenue L and Hudson Tube, $75. Apply Superintendent, 3 Weehawken Street (one block from Hudson River, between Christopher and 10th Streets).

## FURNISHED APARTMENT

12th Street, West, July 1st to October 1st. Beautiful 3-room apartment, all modern conveniences, electrolux, shower, real kitchen, radio. 1 block from subway. Call Chelsea 2670. Address: Box 502, The New Republic.

## HELP WANTED

Editorial Secretary-Stenographer, requirements: expert knowledge of English, general writing ability, experience in related office work. State training, experience, salary. Address: Box 504, The New Republic.

## POSITIONS WANTED

**YOUNG MAN,** exceptional personality, liberal education, whose eyes have recently failed, would like to take charge of a group of exceptional youths next winter. Creative methods in general. Conversational French. Address, Box 496, The New Republic.

**Young professional man,** twenty-five. College graduate, good physique, wishes to act as companion secretary to person traveling here or abroad. Time unlimited, salary secondary. Address: Box 503, The New Republic.

## BOOKS

**THE BOOKS YOU CAN'T GET ELSEWHERE**

may be rented for a nominal fee. Members throughout the United States have access to a large collection of rare, scarce, out-of-print, strange and curious books; limited, privately-printed editions, unabridged translations and extraordinary new books. Please state occupation or profession when writing for information and lists.

**Esoterika Biblion Society**
45 West 45th Street, Dep't C-2 New York City

***The books of***
**JOHN JAY CHAPMAN**
For further particulars write to
A. S. LUSENBERG
156 Fifth Avenue New York City
*Old and rare books*

**FIVE-LANGUAGES-IN-ONE**

French-Spanish-German-Italian-English. Containing 5,000 practical words attractively arranged. Limited supply. $1.50. Order today. Universal Institute, 1265 Lexington Ave., (D12) New York.

**The ANSWER to "PROFITS"**
**by Thorwald Siegfried**

An original, scientific, realistic analysis of problems stated in the book *"PROFITS,"* 37 p., $1, Postpaid. *READY SOON:* "9 Dillars vs. 1 Dollar, $1, Postpaid. "Essays on Waste, Work and War," $1, Postpaid.

**THE WIGWAM PRESS**
**130 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.**

**THAT BOOK YOU WANT!**

We hold 2,000,000 of the best books—new, second-hand, out-of-print, rare—all subjects. Also Sets of Authors. Catalogue free (25 issued). Outline requirements and interests. Books sent on approval. **FOYLES, Charing Cross Rd., London, England.**

## LANGUAGES

**FRENCH, SPANISH,**
**ITALIAN, GERMAN**

Conversational method, Carefully selected Native teachers. Private lessons, 75c ,short course, 9 to 9 daily, 18th year.
**FISHER'S SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES**
**1264 Lexington Avenue, N. W. Cor. 85th St.**

**FRENCH-SPANISH-ITALIAN**

GERMAN. Private lessons 75c Daily 9-9). Native teachers. Interesting conversational method. 19th year. Also neglected English education.
**UNIVERSAL SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES**
**1265 Lexington Ave., Northeast cor 85th St.**

## GRAPHOLOGIST

Do you take a business inventory and forget a personal one? Test yourself graphologically. An illuminating method. Send handwriting. Analysis, $1.00. Miss Florence Lyon, Box 286, Quincy, Mass.

## GENERAL

**REAL HARRIS TWEED**

**The aristocrats of all sports wear—direct from makers. Sample free. Suit-lengths by Mail. Carriage Paid.**
**NEWALL, 159 Stornoway, Scotland.**

## *The New* Republic Idea

by HERBERT CROLY

THE group of men who founded the New Republic in 1914 had a definite conception in their heads of the kind of periodical which they proposed to publish. We called it a journal of opinion. Its object was less to inform or entertain its readers than to start little insurrections in the realm of their convictions. Opinions are the currency by which the citizens of a democracy exchange spiritual values. But just because they pass through many hands, serve so many doubtful purposes, and are accepted at their face value by undiscriminating tradesmen, they tend to become dull, shop-worn and even debased. We hoped to do something towards brightening the coinage of American opinion, sharpening the edges of its design and helping its purveyors to buy five dollars' worth for five dollars. We wished to prick or even goad public opinon into being more vigilant and hospitable, into considering its convictions more carefully and into attaching to them a higher intrinsic value.

In so far as their journal could succeed in becoming a ferment in American opinion, the founders of The New Republic thought they would perform a patriotic service. The American commonwealth, more than any other modern state, originated in an idea. Its fundamental law was framed as the embodiment of a truth. It has always depended and still depends for its integrity on vitality of conviction among its citizens. Its government was not an undesigned historical accident which subsequently received a philosophic or religious justification. Its founders had acted in the light of a group of principles which they and their successors took to be a valid formulation of the political and social conditions of human fulfillment. Americans have never forgotten that their commonwealth was the embodiment of a truth, but they have, particularly of late years, behaved as if the way to keep patriotic truths alive was to remember them conscientiously, to repeat them sedulously and to praise them indiscriminately. This, we thought, was a dangerous mistake. If the American nation was to develop without disorder or violence from its ideal beginnings, its consciousness must keep possession of the national fund of truth, not by memorizing and repeating it, but by bringing it down to date and renewing it.

*Quoted from a pamphlet by Herbert Croly published in 1922 for circulation to subscribers of The New Republic*

## *With next week's issue a special supplement on*

# Herbert Croly

## *containing these articles:*

1. Herbert Croly
   *by* DOROTHY ELMHIRST
2. As a Friend
   *by* PHILIP LITTELL
3. Herbert Croly's Contribution to American Life
   *by* ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
4. Herbert Croly and American Political Opinion
   *by* FELIX FRANKFURTER
5. Notes for a Biography
   *by* WALTER LIPPMANN
6. Herbert Croly's Liberalism
   *by* GEORGE SOULE
7. Herbert Croly and Architecture
   *by* CHARLES L. PLATT
8. Herbert Croly and Journalism
   *by* BRUCE BLIVEN
9. The Promise of Herbert Croly
   *by* WALDO FRANK
10. A Man of Wisdom
    *by* EDUARD C. LINDEMAN
11. "H. C."
    *by* EDMUND WILSON
12. With H. C.
    *by* STARK YOUNG
13. Herbert Croly
    *by* T. S. MATTHEWS
14. Herbert Croly
    *by* RUTH MORGAN

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

THE NEW REPUBLIC, 421 West 21st Street, New York

For the attached $5.00 please enter my subscription for one year.

Name.....Street.....

City.....State.....

7-16-30

Printed by STEINDLER PRESS, INC., 403 Pearl St., New York, N. Y.

# TRAMPLING ART FOR PROFITS

FOR ALL its virtues, modern industrialism **can** run amuck under the spur of greed for profits. Witness, the ruin threatening the Art of Music.

*

300 musicians in Hollywood supply all the "music" offered in thousands of theatres. Can such a tiny reservoir of talent nurture artistic progress?

*

The true function of the machine is to **increase** the value of the product fed into it — not to **debase** it. Therefore mechanical music, **as a substitute** for Living music, is a spurious form of progress—like a loom converting good wool into shoddy.

*

The grind organ, however operated, is a grind organ still. For music is an **emotional art,** a form of social intercourse, and hence, dependent upon human contact.

Who profits by the elimination of genuine music from the theatre? **Not** the music-loving public!

*

If you agree that theatre patrons are entitled to real music — **in addition** to talking and sound motion pictures, for the price they pay — **HELP SAVE THE ART FROM RUIN.** Enroll with millions of others in the Music Defense League. **When the public's voice is raised its will must be served!**

NR-7-9

**AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS**
**1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y.**

***Gentlemen:*** **Without further obligation on my part, please enroll my name in the Music Defense League as one who is opposed to the elimination of Living Music from the theatre.**

*Name*.....

*Addres*.....

*City*.....

*State*.....

## THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS

***(Comprising 140,000 professional musicians in the United States and Canada)***

JOSEPH N. WEBER, President, 1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y.